FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 020

30 January 1984

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

USSR Aide Memoire to U.S. on Arms Violations [IZVESTIYA 30 Jan] AA 1
PRAVDA Editorializes on Andropov Replies, CDE [28 Jan] AA 5
U.S. 'Minus One Plus Two' Arms Reduction Derided [Semeyko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jan] AA 7
Bogachev Scores USIA Booklet on Euromissiles AA 9
Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone Debate Reactivated [Ivanov in IZVESTIYA 27 Jan] AA 10

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Economist Interviewed on Bloc Achievements [TRUD 25 Jan] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV's 28 January 'Studio 9' Program [Zorin, Zamyatin] CC 1
    CDE Positions, Goals CC 1
    Gromyko, Shultz Meeting CC 3
    'Violations' of SALT II CC 5
    Soviet-Japanese Relations CC 6
    PRC Policies, Zhao Trip CC 7
    Europe's Ties With USSR, U.S. CC 8
    U.S. Campaign, Candidates CC 9
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Andrianov, Volskiy, Nekrasov] CC 11
    Andropov, Reagan Statements CC 11
    'Responsibility' of Deployment CC 12
    Aims of Zhao's U.S. Visit CC 14
    Near East, C. America Issues CC 15
Antarctic Mineral Resources Protection Meeting CC 17

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Announcement of Reelection Bid Noted A 1
    Kornilov Hits Campaign Slogan A 1
'Face-Lift' in Reagan USSR Policy 'Maneuvering' [Zorin] A 2
Gerasimov Reviews U.S. Positions on Dialogue A 3

CHINA

Sino-Soviet Amity Groups Meet, Mark Festival B 1
  Tikhvinskiy Speaks B 1
  Kapitsa at Festival Event B 1
PRC Envoy Presented Chinese-Russian Dictionary [IZVESTIYA 29 Jan] B 2
  Kapitsa at Ceremony B 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Approaches to Peace, 'Fate of Detente' Viewed [Burlatskiy in Sofia NOVO VREME No 1] F 1
Romanian Reaction to Andropov Interview Cited [IZVESTIYA 27 Jan] F 11
U.S. 'Easing' of Polish Sanctions Scoffed [Danilov] F 11
Regular Session of Polish Sjem Reported F 12
TASS, PAP Sign New Cooperation Agreement F 12

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Middle East Policy, Role Analyzed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] H 1
Congress Pressured on Lebanon Troop Withdrawal H 1
  'Catastrophic Consequences' H 1
  Anti-War Demonstrations [Druzhinin] H 2
U.S. Actions in Lebanon Dubbed 'Reagan's Vietnam' [Andreyev] H 3
Syria's Al-Asad Denounces U.S. Aggression H 4
FRG's Kohl's Visit to Israel 'Most Complicated' [Grechkov] H 4
Tudeh Member Trials, Persecution Viewed H 5

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

France Preparing Offensive Operations in Chad J 1
U.S. Aid, Investment in Somalia Criticized J 1

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU 'Open Letter' to Election Commissions R 1
Andropov Registers for Supreme Soviet Elections [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 29 Jan] R 3
Supreme Soviet Election Propaganda Viewed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jan] R 4
Leaders Attend Moscow Party Conference R 4
Grishin Elected First Secretary in Moscow Gorkom R 5
Party Congress 17th Anniversary Reviewed [Kolesnikov in PRAVDA 26 Jan] R 6
Fulfillment of Deputies' Mandates Noted [IZVESTIYA 21 Jan] R 9

Role of Discipline in Productivity Discussed
[Chaplygin in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 20 Jan] R 11
Psychological Consequences of Emigration Noted
[Matulyavichus in KOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jan] R 14
CPSU Academic Assesses Dangers of Religion
[Filimov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jan] R 16
Truck Driver on Misreporting of Fuel Delivery
[PRAVDA 23 Jan] R 18
Orwell's '1984' Reviewed on Eve of New Year
[Tsoppi in NEW TIMES No 52, Dec] R 20
New Ferry Links Baltic Island With Mainland
[PRAVDA 20 Jan] R 24

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Interethnic Relations in Soviet Army Viewed
[Arapov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jan] V 1
Historian Hits Western View of Leningrad Battle V 3
Far East Military Party Conference Held
[Zakharenko, P. Chernenko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jan] V 4
Educational Role of Heroism in Military Viewed
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jan] V 7
Conference Held on Military School Admissions
[Zemskov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jan] V 9
Moscow Meeting Opens 'Mass Defense Work Month'
[Semyanovskiy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jan] V 9

USSR AIDE MEMOIRE TO U.S. ON ARMS VIOLATIONS

PM292051 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jan 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "The United States Is Violating Its International Commitments"]

[Text] A few days ago the Embassy of the USSR in Washington presented the following aide memoire to the U.S. Department of State:

Aide Memoire

The Soviet side finds it necessary to draw the attention of the American side to the latter's actions in the field of arms limitation. The point at issue is the approach of the United States to the very process of arms limitation and reduction and the fulfillment of the legal and political commitments it has assumed in this field.

For a lengthy period of time there have been and do exist reasons for serious concern in this respect. The Soviet side has repeatedly raised the relevant questions before the American side. At the same time patience and restraint were displayed from the Soviet side in the hope that the American side would take the necessary measures to rectify the situation.

This, however, did not happen. More than that, such negative actions have snowballed and become especially serious in the general context of the militaristic policy pursued by the present Administration of the United States.

I.

A "comprehensive strategic program" for the eighties of unprecedented scope and providing for the accelerated deployment of new systems of strategic offensive forces, such as the "MX" and "Midgetman" intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear-powered submarines armed with "Trident" missiles, "B-1B" and "Stealth" strategic bombers, the multipurpose "shuttle" space system and long-range air-, sea- and land-based cruise missiles, was adopted and is being carried out in the United States.

The size of the military preparations carried out by the United States is evidenced by the tremendous military expenditures that cannot be justified by any reasonable defense requirements. In the past three years alone, this spending exceeded $640 billion, while in 1985-1989, as it has been announced, it will amount to $2 trillion, or almost as much as has been spent on these aims during 35 postwar years.

It is not concealed that all this is **being-done** with the aim of achieving military superiority.

At the same time, the talks on nuclear arms in Geneva were blocked and frustrated because of the position taken by the American side. Earlier, the United States had unilaterally stopped the talks on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on the Indian Ocean, on antisatellite systems, etc. Thereby, the United States has disorganized the process of limiting armaments that had been developed over many years by the joint efforts of states and which ensured the attainment of tangible positive results.

This line of the United States directly contradicts the generally recognized norms and principles of international law as well as the fundamental Soviet-American accords in which it is clearly stipulated that neither side shall strive for military superiority and that in their relations they shall guide themselves by the principle of equality and identical [odinakovyy] security. Neither does the above-mentioned line tally with the commitments of the United States under Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the parties to which have solemnly undertaken to conduct talks in a spirit of goodwill on effective measures to stop the nuclear arms race in the nearest future and on nuclear disarmament.

II.

Instances when the American side deviates from the strict observance of concrete legal and political commitments assumed by it, sidesteps these commitments, and sometimes even directly violates them are becoming even more frequent.

1. Having signed the SALT-II treaty, the United States refused to put it into force. This obstructionist stand of the United States resulted in the non-fulfillment of a substantial element of accord related to the solution of questions included in the protocol to the SALT-II treaty which, as is known, is its integral part. Thereby, the United States did not fulfill the provision concerning the working out of mutually acceptable solutions in respect of a certain category of strategic arms, first of all long-range sea- and land-based cruise missiles. And as it is perfectly clear now, this was done with the aim of getting a free hand for the mass deployment of long-range cruise missiles, which cannot but have an extremely destabilizing impact.

The question arises: How does such an attitude to accords under SALT-II tally with statements about the intention of the United States to refrain from actions undermining existing agreements on strategic arms?

By commencing the deployment in Western Europe of "Pershing II" ballistic missiles and long-range land-based cruise missiles capable of reaching targets on the territory of the USSR, the American side violated the provisions of the SALT II treaty prohibiting circumvention of the treaty through any other state or states, or in any other manner, and also the undertaking of any international commitments whatsoever that would contradict the treaty. It is clear that the deployment in Western Europe of nuclear arms, which are an obvious addition to the strategic offensive arsenal of the United States, does not square in any way with the commitment of the United States to refrain from actions undermining the SALT II treaty.

Already this sufficiently demonstrates the attitude of the United States to accords signed by it and to observance of obligations undertaken by it. As to the attempts of the American side to cast aspersions on the USSR's honest and responsible approach to the fulfillment of its commitments, they are untenable and can be qualified as being openly directed at worsening Soviet-American relations.

3. There is reason to doubt the proper observance by the United States at least of some of the provisions of the 1972 interim agreement. In this connection special attention should be given to the fact that the United States has introduced the practice of using shelters over ICBM launchers. The USSR, as is known, has repeatedly raised the question of the need for the United States to stop using shelters over the launchers of "Minuteman II" ICMB's and also of "Titan II" because these actions contradict the provisions of the agreement on the carrying out of effective verification.

In this connection serious concern is caused by the use of such shelters over silos for "Minuteman II" missiles. For a long period of time, the American side refrained from stopping the use of shelters. As it transpired later, this was done to conceal work to refit these launchers.

Since the thus refitted launchers of the "Minuteman II" missiles do not differ in practical terms from the launchers of "Minuteman III" missiles, it can be conjectured that it is mirved "Minuteman III" missiles that are really deployed in those silos. If that is so, the outright and arrogant failure of the United States to observe the provisions of the interm agreement on verification means at the same time also failure to honor one of the main commitments under the SALT II treaty on limiting the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles.

4. There have been also other cases giving rise to serious doubt about the fulfillment by the United States of its commitments concerning strategic offensive arms. The Soviet side raised these questions.

The intention of the United States to create two new types of intercontinental ballistic missiles -- the MX and the "Midgetman" -- does not accord with the tasks of limiting strategic arms that have found reflection in the attained agreements. There is a direct connection here also with the fact that at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms the American side insisted on having no limitations whatsoever imposed on the creation of new types of ICBMs and SLAMs.

III.

Likewise, the certain actions of the United States in respect of the timeless treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems (ABM) cannot but give rise to concern, and the USSR has repeatedly addressed the American side on this matter.

1. Clearly in contradiction with the commitments under the treaty the United States has deployed a big radar station on Shemya Island, the construction of which entailed the utilization of radar system elements tested for ABM purposes; shelters were used over antimissile launcher silos; work is being conducted to create mobile ABM radar systems and space-based ABM systems; the "Minuteman I" ICBMs are being tested to give such missiles antimissile capabilities; multiple warheads are being developed for ABM missiles [protivorakety], etc.

2. Contrary to the commitment not to deploy systems for the antiballistic missile defense of the territory of the country and not to create a foundation for such defense new big "pave paws" radar stations, the parameters of which have been brought up to the level of demands made of ABM radar stations and which can serve as a basis for providing radar backing for the ABM defense of the territory of the United States, are being deployed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States and also on the southern direction. No measures have been taken from the American side to remove the concern caused by its actions.

3. Last, the logical question cannot but be raised: With what aims is the United States developing ABM systems, which, in the event of their deployment, would transcend the framework permitted by the treaty and, in effect, lead to the undermining of the treaty? For it was exactly plans to create such a large-scale ABM system that were officially announced by the American side in March 1983.

It is difficult to imagine that the American side is not aware that steps in this direction would have very far-reaching consequences: disruption of the organic interconnection between limitations on defensive and offensive strategic arms with the resultant most negative impact on the prospects of limiting and reducing strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet side expects that the United States will take practical actions to ensure strict fulfillment of the ABM treaty, including renunciation of preparations to deploy a large-scale ABM system.

4. The American side systematically violates the agreed-upon principle of observing the confidentiality of the discussion of questions connected with the fulfillment of commitments on the limitation of strategic arms, and this is detrimental to the normal activity of the Soviet-American standing consultative commission. This is impermissible and must be stopped.

IV.

1. The ambiguous, essentially negative approach of the American side to the cause of arms limitation is evidenced also by its attitude to the treaties on underground nuclear weapon tests and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes of 1974 and 1976, which the United States has not ratified to this day, thereby blocking the entry into effect of a number of important measures directed at raising confidence in the strict fulfillment of agreements.

Such a stand cannot but raise doubts about the aims that are being thus pursued. What definitely backs up these doubts is that according to data in the possession of the Soviet side, there have been repeated instances of the American side exceeding the imposed ceiling on the yield of the tested nuclear devices. Despite the assurances that the United States intends to observe the 150-kiloton limitation, the practice of exceeding the permitted limit of yield of the nuclear devices that are being tested appears to be continuing.

2. The Soviet side had approached the United States also about instances of the ejection of radioactive substances beyond the national territory of the United States as a result of underground nuclear explosions staged by the American side, this being a violation of the 1963 treaty prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

All these facts do not appear to have a chance nature at all. The American program of drastically building up and modernizing nuclear weapons, the reluctance of the United States to conduct talks on the conclusion of an agreement on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, its rejection of the Soviet-proposed moratorium on all nuclear weapon [boyepripasy] tests speaks for itself.

3. A similar line is being pursued by the American side in the field of chemical weapons as well. The United States declines bilateral talks and accord with the USSR on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on liquidating stockpiles of them, while at the disarmament conference in Geneva it is actually blocking the attainment of a realistic agreement on a multilateral basis. Neither is the United States giving a positive response to the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member states on totally freeing Europe from chemical weapons, which would be an important step along the road to a radical solution of this problem.

It is hard to ride oneself of the impression that this line, too, is not an accidental one since at the very same time the United States is accelerating the production of toxic chemical agents of a new generation (binary ones) and intends almost to double its total stockpiles of chemical weapons. It is also known that the United States has deployed large quantities of chemical weapons in Europe countries.

V.

Under the Helsinki Final Act, the United States undertook to participate in efforts directed at lessening military confrontation and at promoting disarmament.

In reality, however, in recent years it carried out a whole number of actions that brought about a drastic growth of the military danger in Europe. This refers first of all to the deployment there of new American first-strike nuclear missiles, the creation of conditions for a substantial buildup of American troops in Europe and the continuing arming of these troops with means of mass annihilation -- nuclear, chemical, and other.

In addition to this, the United States annually stages military exercises in Europe on a tremendous scale and it is becoming increasingly more diffiuclt to distinguish them from an actual deployment of armed forces for waging war. Simple notifications of such exercises without a limitation of their scope do nothing to remove the dangerous nature of such actions.

These actions of the United States, its entire policy of recent years in respect of Europe undermine the process of strengthening security in Europe, the mainstays of which were laid by the Helsinki Final Act, that was signed, among others, also by the United States.

The question of the attitude of the United States to its commitments is acquiring an ever more serious and urgent nature. The Soviet side is raising it not for the purpose of polemics. We are speaking about very important things and first of all about trust. If the American side, as it claims, is interested in the continuation of an effective process of arms limitation, it should draw the proper practical conclusions for itself.

PRAVDA EDITORIALIZES ON ANDROPOV REPLIES, CDE

PM271810 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 84 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Making the World Safe"]

[Text] The preservation and strengthening of world peace have been and remain the paramount concern of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. Millions of people on the planet note with invariable gratitude that in the present alarming international situation it is the USSR and its allies that are the source of specific realistic proposals paving a reliable way to confidence and cooperation between countries and peoples.

Reports are coming in from all corners of our country regarding Soviet people's ardent approval of the propositions contained in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's answers to PRAVDA's questions. This document provides a profound, clear analysis of the reasons for the dangerous tension in international relations and determines ways of overcoming it. It has met with paramount attention and a broad response among the international public. People of goodwill everywhere regard this document as yet another manifestation of the USSR's love of peace.

The main factor generating the threat of war is the militarist course of the present U.S. Administration, which is trying at all costs to smash the existing correlation of forces, to secure U.S. military superiority, and to ensure a dominant position in the world for Washington. Disregarding the people's desire for peace, the U.S. ruling circles have embarked on the deployment of new American first-strike missiles in a number of West European countries. They are endeavoring to lull the vigilance of the peoples, who are worried by the danger of war, with statements that these actions are explained, or so they claim, by a desire to ensure Europe's security. These claims are sheer deception of the peoples.

In fact the nuclear threat to Europe has now increased considerably, and the security of the United States itself has not strengthened either. At the same time political tension in the world has intensified. Washington has wrecked the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, whose goal was to limit and substantially reduce nuclear arms. No matter how representatives of the U.S. Administration try to pose as "peacemakers," the peoples see that the responsibility for this development of events is borne by the U.S. leaders and the governments of the NATO countries that allowed the American missiles onto their territory.

Washington's policy is profoundly hostile to the interests of peace and international cooperation not only in Europe. New countries and regions are becoming the target of imperialist brigandage. The American military is sowing death and destruction in the Near East, Central America, and Grenada in an attempt to preserve or impose dictatorial regimes hated by the peoples.

Imperialism's dangerous course is countered by the consistent peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The USSR and the other socialist community countries have put forward a proposal to clear Europe from nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical. The Soviet Union is prepared to take any real opportunity to reach practical accords on limiting and reducing nuclear arms on the only possible basis under present conditions -- on the basis of the principles of equality and identical security.

"...The Soviet Union is prepared to resolve the problem of nuclear arms in Europe only on a constructive, mutually acceptable basis," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov notes. Just one thing is necessary for this -- before it is too late the United States and NATO must show a readiness to return to the situation that existed before the start of the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles. We are confronting the United States and its NATO allies with this question because we want to avoid yet another round of the arms race, this time at a new and even more dangerous level leading to the growth of tension and instability in Europe.

Peace in Europe and throughout the world would be substantially strengthened if the United States were to follow the example of the USSR, which has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. But the U.S. leaders are refusing to do this. A significant step in increasing confidence in Europe and not only in Europe would be the adoption by the NATO countries of the Warsaw Pact states' proposal on not using military forces against one another. However, the NATO countries also reject this peace initiative.

The USSR is proposing that a simple and at the same time effective step be taken -- that nuclear arms be frozen. The need to resolve the problem of preventing an arms race in space is becoming increasingly urgent. The Soviet Union, which has put forward specific proposals on this question, calls on the United States to embark immediately on the discussion of them.

The Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe could do a considerable amount in the preservation of peace. Here too the USSR and the other socialist countries have put forward proposals for large-scale measures leading to the strengthening of confidence and security.

An acute, dangerous situation has been created in the world as a result of imperialism's policy. Naturally, the USSR and its allies are forced to take retaliatory measures dictated by the desire to save the peoples from the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

The realistic and constructive program for ensuring peace upheld by the Soviet Union is enjoying the peoples' growing sympathy and support. Their will is expressed by the mighty antiwar, antimissile movement, which has become an objective reality of our time. The extraordinary session of the WPC Presidium that has just ended in West Berlin reaffirmed the determination of peace-loving forces to achieve their noble, humane objectives.

The land of the Soviets is invariably in the vanguard of the struggle for lasting peace. A reliable prop of the USSR's peace-loving policy is the selfless labor of our whole people, who are rallied closely around Lenin's party. Rallies and meetings at which Soviet people are stating their vigorous support for the CPSU's foreign policy course and their determination to defend world peace are currently being held everywhere in our country.

U.S. 'MINUS ONE PLUS TWO' ARMS REDUCTION DERIDED

PM271439 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jan 84 Second Edition p 3

[Candidate of Military Sciences L. Semeyko article under the rubric "We Tell the Story at the Request of Readers": "Fraudulent Maneuver. What Is Concealed Behind the Plans To Remove Obsolete U.S. Nuclear Ammunition From Europe"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "The press has reported a decision to remove a certain proportion of American nuclear ammunition from Europe. What is concealed behind these plans?" -- Captain S. Yedapin.

What tricks do the U.S. and NATO leaders resort to in order somehow to reassure the world public, which is indignant at the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Europe? One of these tricks is the widely publicized intention to begin the withdrawal of 1,400 American tactical items of nuclear ammunition from Europe this year. Western propaganda seeks to present this step as proof of Washington's "love of peace." But in fact all this turns out to be attempts with useless means. It is sufficient to take into account the nature of NATO rearmament and also to go into the actual political and military reasons for the proclaimed "reduction" of the American nuclear arsenal in Europe in order to make obvious the duplicity and the deception which are designed to conceal the chief thing: The nuclear potential of the United States in Europe and, consequently, also of NATO as a whole is not decreasing but increasing.

Let us start with the fact that in the eighties the United States is planning to produce 17,000 new items of nuclear ammunition, 11,000 of which will go to replace obsolete ones. The net addition, so to say -- 6,000 items of nuclear ammunition -- speaks for itself. A sizable proportion of the new warheads will be earmarked for hitting heavily defended military targets. It should not be forgotten here that the policy of qualitative rearmament for the purpose of creating the strategic potential for a first, "disabling" strike is also being pursued while building up U.S. forward-based nuclear means. It is for precisely this that the deployment of almost 600 highly accurate medium-range American nuclear missiles has been begun in Europe. "The appearance of American missiles in Europe has increased not only military but also political tension," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov declared in reply to PRAVDA's questions. "The talks aimed at limiting and substantially reducing nuclear arms have been wrecked. Interstate relations have gotten into a field of dangerous tension."

The U.S. Administration has not decided to get rid of obsolete nuclear weapons in Europe in order to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation but in order to try to reap both a political and a military benefit by fraudulent means.

In the political sphere they are gambling on the idea that they will succeed in misleading the public with the widely publicized "reduction" and in suggesting to it that the deployment of new American missiles in Europe does not signify a nuclear arms buildup.

It was no accident that the report on the planned withdrawal of part of the obsolete U.S. nuclear arsenal from Europe was timed to coincide precisely with the start of this deployment.

Now to turn to the purely military aims. Qualitative rearmament not only compensates for, but also more than makes up for the certain quantitative reduction in nuclear ammunition. Consequently, the NATO armed forces' combat potential as a whole grows. The new American missiles "will be a more than effective replacement" for the ammunition being cut, the American magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT frankly admits. They are also gambling on the considerably greater efficiency of the new nuclear and neutron missile and artillery ammunition being adopted. Taking the place of the ammunition being cut, it will have a longer range and greater accuracy and destructive capability.

The Nike Hercules nuclear air defense missiles, which were deployed back in the fifties and are not capable of hitting aerial targets at low altitudes, are also deemed inappropriate for the strategic situation in the eighties. It is planned to replace them with Roland and Patriot "all-altitude" antiaircraft missiles with conventional charges. Washington and Bonn are planning to deploy thousands of these new missiles "to improve" the air defense of American and West German bases in the FRG. Washington is insisting that other NATO countries also acquire new air defense missiles.

The removal of the Nike Hercules missiles from the arsenal is also hypocritically substantiated by the claim that the use of nuclear air defense facilities would represent danger to the territory of the countries where they are used. The hypocritical nature of this argument becomes particularly obvious against the background of the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles, which are turning West European countries into Washington's hostages. Official circles also attempt to explain the planned withdrawal of American nuclear mines from the FRG with reference to the "excessive danger." Although it is sometimes admitted even in the Western press that the planned liquidation of the nuclear mine belts is further evidence of the intensification of offensive accents in NATO military strategy.

"I would be happy to be rid of a still greater quantity of arms if we can carry out the modernization of our nuclear systems," General Rogers, supreme commander in chief, NATO allied armed forces in Europe, declared. According to him, he agreed to a reduction in nuclear ammunition only after he had been assured that it could happen only by means of replacing obsolete nuclear arms with more efficient and modern systems, even ones with nonnuclear charges.

The American general's admission is very remarkable. First, it confirms that the "reduction" will be purely formal in nature since, in the final analysis, it will lead to an increase in both the nuclear and the nonnuclear arsenals of NATO. Second, the reference to replacing the now rather ineffective nuclear-arms with the latest arms -- both nuclear and conventional -- attests that the United States is stepping up preparations for warfare involving the use of all kinds of weapons and combat hardware. Here are the latest systems of conventional highly accurate weapons, which approximate to tactical nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive power, could be used, like medium-range nuclear missiles, to inflict a first, "disabling" strike. The "Rogers plan" provides for massive strikes to be inflicted deep into the operational formation of enemy troops at the very earliest stage of a conflict involving the use, above all, of ground- and air-launched missiles with highly accurate guidance systems. This new concept is being given a material basis: It is planned, so THE NEW YORK TIMES reported recently, to adopt more than 400 new weapon and combat hardware systems.

In light of all this, the Pentagon's readiness to remove obsolete nuclear weapons from Europe becomes understandable. The improved and, in fact, qualitatively totally new nuclear potential combined with the latest nonnuclear potential is designed to accord to a greater extent with the aims of the American offensive and aggressive strategy of "direct confrontation." The United States is also undertaking the pseudoreduction because its NATO nuclear allies are planning to increase the numbers and improve the qualitative potential of their own forces, both nuclear and conventional.

These are the political and military ins and outs of the farce over the planned withdrawal of part of the U.S. nuclear ammunition from Europe. Its essence is not "minus two plu one," as Pentagon and NATO lovers of graphic formulas try to depict it, but rather "minus one plus two." The figleaf of the publicized "nuclear reduction" cannot hide the accelerated buildup of the NATO military potential for the purpose of upsetting the regional and global military-strategic equilibrium. Nor can it hide the fact that the United States and its allies, by keeping a huge arsenal of several thousand items of nuclear ammunition on the European Continent, are continuing to gamble on their first use. "There is no need to wring one's hands over the threat to use nuclear weapons," General Rogers declared. These words, which smack of overt cynicism, once again lay bare the whole spuriousness of the Washington and NATO venture.

As is known, any war in Europe is fraught with the risk of escalating into a nuclear war with all the ensuing fatal consequences. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states have advanced specific, constructive proposals really aimed at removing this threat. However, all their initiatives have been rejected by the American Administration and the NATO leadership. They also stubbornly reject the proposal not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms against one another and, consequently, not be the first to use military force at all against one another. The United States and NATO are seeking at all costs to upset the established military equilibrium.

The Soviet Union cannot disregard this. To ensure the security of the USSR and the other socialist community countries countermeasures are being taken which, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov declared, "will be maintained strictly within the limits dictated by the NATO countries' actions."

BOGACHEV SCORES USIA BOOKLET ON EUROMISSILES

LD271947 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] Moscow January 27 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The leaders of the U.S. propaganda body, USIA, have apparently decided that it is professional pen-pushers who should be given responsibility for answering questions from millions of people badly worried over the consequences of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

USIA's latest booklet on the problems of nuclear weapons in Europe and on the background of the Geneva talks on that problem is replete with semi-truths, omissions and deliberate misrepresentations.

The authors of the booklet claim, for instance, that if the Soviet Union accepts the U.S. "zero option" a whole class of medium-range missiles will be eliminated. In so doing, the USIA pen-pushers "forget" to explain that under the U.S. proposal a whole class of Soviet missiles alone would be eliminated. The NATO countries would in that case retain all their similar weapons intact.

In particular, British and French nuclear missiles would continue to be aimed at the Warsaw Treaty countries.

USIA characterises as "unacceptable" the Soviet demands that British and French nuclear missiles be counted in the overall balance of forces because those missiles presumably are a deterrent against aggression. Incidentally, under the "intermediate solution" Washington is prepared to count its own nuclear missiles, thereby indirectly admitting that they are not a "deterrent" but a weapon of aggression.

Meanwhile, even today the French and British missiles are carrying 420 nuclear warheads. By the 1990's the number of French nuclear warheads will grow sixfold. The European NATO countries account for 25 per cent of the nuclear potential of the North Atlantic alliance in Europe. There thus arises the question which USIA even does not attempt to answer: Why does not the Soviet Union have a similar right to security as the USA, Britain and France have? Why do they want to have the Soviet Union defenseless in the face of the British and French missiles aimed at socialist countries?

The USIA propagandists do not shrink from trifling lies in their booklet. For instance, they claim that before December 1983 the North Atlantic alliance had not had in Western Europe a single ground-based medium-range nuclear missile. Meanwhile, every NATO reference book admits that in addition to the 144 British and French sea-based missiles, there are 18 French ground-based medium-range missiles.

Naturally, the American booklet does not even try to explain why the USA wants to secure from the USSR consent to the deployment of U.S. missiles in West Germany so that their flight time to sensitive targets in Soviet territory would be 6-12 minutes, while denying the Soviet Union the right to deploy similar missiles with similar yields and accuracy and a similar flight time to targets in the USA? Washington's purpose is to tip the existing balance of forces in Europe.

"Why then is the present-day world situation deliberately distorted on the statements of American leaders? First and foremost, to try to dispel the worry of the peoples, growing from one day to the next, over Washington's militarist policy and to dampen the wave of growing opposition to that policy," Yuriy Andropov stresses in his replies to questions from PRAVDA.

NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE DEBATE REACTIVATED

PM271603 Moscow IZVESTIYA In Russian 27 Jan 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent N. Ivanov under the rubric "International Commentary": "Shadow of Cruise Missiles Over Northern Europe"]

[Text] Helsinki -- Now that the U.S. cruise missiles, alongside the Pershings, are occupying their positions in Europe, many inhabitants of West European countries are justifiably asking: Over which states will the missiles' trajectories pass in the event of a conflict?

The discussion has gone beyond the framework of the press. It has affected many people, and politicians, public figures, and military men have responded to it. It cannot be said that the opinions of the threat created by the U.S. missiles to the security of the north European countries have been couched in the same terms. Some people are obviously seeking to belittle the danger, to present matters as though the cruise missiles were not first-strike weapons and their trajectories would "bypass" Scandinavia.

How can we fail to recall FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, who, during his recent visit to Helsinki, made every attempt to persuade people that the new U.S. missiles do not affect the security of Finland and Sweden?

The indisputable truth, although some people try to deny it, is that the deployment of the U.S. cruise missiles in Britain or the FRG, for instance, threatens the security of the north European countries. You don't need to be a specialist to conclude that if the Pershings and cruise missiles are put into operation, their routes will inevitably pass over the airspace of third countries -- from Scandinavia to the Balkans.

Some 2 years ago the Swedish parliament commission on defense questions prepared a report that states most definitely that the cruise missiles would not bypass Sweden's airspace. Some 3 years before that in Stockholm, speaking at the foreign policy institute, the then Finnish President U.K. Kekkonen expressed anxiety in connection with the development of military technology and the appearance of the cruise missiles.

Many Finnish figures are now voicing mounting concern at the threat presented by the U.S. cruise missiles to Finland's security. Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen recently said that Finland's official representatives do not underestimate the danger presented to the country by the cruise missiles. "Modern missiles which can be launched from land, sea, or air also create problems for Finland," he said. (K. Ternudd), deputy secretary of state of the Finnish Foreign Ministry, asserted that "Finnish foreign policy constantly draws attention to the dangers connected with the cruise missiles."

Under these conditions the discussion on turning north Europe into a nuclear-free north could safeguard the region's security against encroachments by nuclear maniacs. It is no accident that from the outset U.K. Kekkonen's proposal generated active resistance from the United States and NATO. Washington has frequently stated publicly that the idea of a nuclear-free north does not comply with NATO aims and strategy. These aims have now been clarified. The NATO strategists are charting the cruise missiles' routes on the maps. They do pass over the north European countries. The nuclear threat to these countries increased considerably after the NATO bloc swelled its arsenals with the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles.

But does that mean that under these conditions U.K. Kekkonen's proposal has lost its meaning? It would be wrong to suppose that the deployment of the U.S. missiles on our continent disposes of the question of a nuclear-free north. Matters are otherwise -- this idea is becoming particularly topical.

The Finnish press recalls that it was the Soviet Union which from the outset actively came out in support of the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in north Europe and that it was only NATO's negative stance which barred the way to its implementation. "The idea of a nuclear-free north must not be consigned to oblivion. It is a feasible path to the north European countries' security," the newspaper SUOMENMAA notes. Broad public circles of all countries of the region agree with that.

CEMA ECONOMIST INTERVIEWED ON BLOC ACHIEVEMENTS

PM261554 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Jan 84 p 3

[Interview with K.I. Popov, scientific worker at the International Institute of the Economic Problems of the world Socialist System, by R. Radulov, correspondent of the Bulgarian newspaper TRUD, and own correspondent A. Kalashnikov: "CEMA: At New Heights" -- date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Some 35 years ago, on 25 January 1949, a report was published on the creation of CEMA. Correspondents from the fraternal trade union newspapers TRUD (Bulgaria) and TRUD (USSR) asked Doctor of Economic Sciences Professor K.I. Popov, scientific worker at the CEMA International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System, to comment on this event.

Question: With what achievements are the CEMA countries greeting the jubilee?

Answer: Some 10 percent of the planet's population live in the CEMA countries, but their share of world industrial production is currently 33 percent. In 1950 it was only 18 percent.

Compared with the 1950 level, national income as a whole in the CEMA countries in 1982 has increased by 730 percent, including increases of 1,200 percent in Bulgaria, and 590 percent in the GDR. By the start of 1983 the CEMA countries' real per capita income had increased by 360 percent compared with the 1950 level, including increases of 390 percent in Bulgaria, 480 percent in the GDR, and 350 percent in the USSR.

Many other examples can be cited to show that the socialist community countries are striding confidently along the path of socioeconomic progress. They are overcoming objective and subjective diffculties and contradictions, are searching for the optimum forms and methods of economic leadership, and are eradicating definite errors and shortcomings in this sphere. All this is happening under conditions of a threat of war, a policy of trade discrimination, and sometimes even a strict economic blockade on the part of the imperialist powers.

uestion: What do the socialist countries gain from participation in CEMA?

Answer: CEMA began its activity mainly on the questions of expanding production and deliveries of goods in short supply, particularly those embargoed by the NATO states. Reciprocal deliveries between the CEMA countries currently account for 70 to 100 percent of their import requirements for oil and oil products, hard coal and coke, natural gas, iron ore, and cotton. Raw material and fuel shipments come mainly from the Soviet Union since the other CEMA members do not have the necessary natural resources. Reciprocal deliveries, including those from the USSR, account on average for around two-thirds of the CEMA countries' total imports of machines and equipment.

For its part the Soviet Union obtains a considerable quantity of products that it needs. For instance, machine-building items imported from these countries represent around 10 percent of all the equipment annually installed in Soviet enterprises. The CEMA countries supply up to 40 percent of replacements for the Soviet maritime fleet, 35 percent of new passenger railcars, and 12 percent of buses.

The development of mutual deliveries within the CEMA framework is vivid evidence of the fraternal nature of these countries' mutual relations, and of the economically developed countries' aid to less developed countries that are on the path of expanding their national economy and increasing their people's prosperity.

This is well seen from the example of Bulgaria. This country, which before the start of the fifties had never exported machine-building products at all, delivered R2.1-billion worth of this output to the USSR in 1982, and imported Soviet machines and equipment worth R1 billion. With the Soviet Union's economic and technical aid over 180 major industrial enterprises have been built in Bulgaria, which account for 65 percent of Bulgarian industrial production, according to expert Bulgarian assessment.

The entire 35-year history of CEMA activity confirms that cooperation among the CEMA countries takes place on the basis of mutual respect for national interests, equal rights, mutual gain, and mutual aid.

Question: What tasks currently face CEMA?

Answer: In developing and supplementing the Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic Integration adopted in 1971, the community countries are jointly implementing a number of new plans, among which an especially important place is held by the five long-term targeted cooperation programs aimed at meeting, by joint efforts, the countries' rapidly growing requirements for energy, fuel, basic raw materials, foodstuffs, and industrial consumer goods, at raising machine-building standards, and at accelerating the development of transport.

Two of the five targeted programs -- in the sphere of agriculture and the catering industry, and also consumer goods -- are aimed directly at satisfying the growing demand of the socialist countries' population.

Some of the most important of the measures outlined are the construction in the CEMA countries, with the Soviet Union's collaboration, of nuclear power stations with a total installed capacity of up to 37 million kw, and two AESes of 4-million-kw capacity on USSR territory, mainly to supply electric power to other community countries.

The implementation of the agreement on specialization and production sharing in the development and production of computer technology will make it possible to apply microcomputers and industrial robots in the CEMA countries much more widely, thereby significantly enhancing labor productivity.

The fulfillment of these programs and agreements requires clear and coordinated work from our countries' planning organs, and sectorial and other ministries and departments, and an improvement in the entire mechanism of their cooperation.

As is well known, the 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the fraternal parties of the CEMA countries recognized the need to take measures to more closely coordinate the economic policy of these countries, and to improve the entire integration mechanism. There is no doubt that increasing the effectiveness of cooperation among the socialist community countries will strengthen their national economies, promote further socioeconomic progress, and cement the unity and cohesion of these countries.

MOSCOW TV'S 28 JANUARY 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

LD282117 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1555 GMT 28 Jan 84

["Studio 9" program moderated by political observer Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, with Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

CDE Positions, Goals

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting together in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center of our monthly program in which we discuss topical problems of world politics. Many questions have come from you to Studio 9 recently. They are evidently of general interest, and we have decided to devote today's program to replies to your letters. We have asked Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department to do this. Hardly anyone is going to be surprised by the fact that recently many of your letters are devoted to the conference on measures to strengthen confidence, security and disarmament in Europe, which is taking place in Stockholm. the writers of these letters formulate their questions in different ways. In general, however, these questions amount to this: What influence can be exerted and is being exerted by this conference upon the international situation?

[Zamyatin] Gathering in the Swedish capital are representatives of the same countries that signed the Final Act in Helsinki -- and this conference is a continuation of the policy outlined in the Helsinki Final Act -- 33 European countries and the United States and Canada. Although only a little time has passed and so far there is little to discuss in the way of results, it has shown that the representatives of different countries have come to this conference with different intentions. Tension in relations between countries has reached the hottest point. Representatives who have already outlined their countries' positions in Stockholm, provide grounds for saying quite precisely what it is that they have brought to this conference.

The Soviet delegation has not just exposed the basic causes of tension in international relations; it has not merely shown that the main responsibility for the present tension and for the breakdown in the process of detente is borne by the United States; and primarily by the Reagan administration, which came to power 3 years ago and did everything possible to undermine the process of detente, in order somehow to eradicate it from human society and to replace it with another process -- the process of the arms race, the process of American hegemonism -- of the imposition of the American way of life and of the transformation of terrorism into official U.S. policy. This is what the United States has proposed as a replacement for detente.

But this does not mean that European states that are concerned by this development of world events have rejected the process of detente. Of itself, the Stockholm conference stresses that the process of detente is alive, it has taken root deeply in the life of the peoples of Europe, and that Europe would like to continue to live and to develop relations among states on the basis of this process.

But U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, who was one of the first to speak at this round of the conference in Stockholm, made a speech that effectively contained nothing new as far as the development of international life and international events are concerned, in comparison with what the United States has been saying recently. The only new point for the Continent of Europe, perhaps, was his statement that it is the fact that Europe is divided -- and not the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe or U.S. policy in Europe -- that is, in the view of the United States, the destabilizing factor.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, can his statement be considered an encroachment upon the existing borders in Europe, something that was fixed in Helsinki?

[Zamyatin] Undoubtedly; that is how it was evaluated in the speeches of many countries, which consider this to be a sudden attack upon one of the basic principles of the Helsinki Final Act -- the inviolability of the post-war European borders. Now a threatening gesture is being made against this principle, too, in order to heat up tension on this continent even more.

Another interesting thing is the fact that the conference itself has been convened to discuss, at this acute moment, possible measures to build confidence and security. As you know, the conference will consist of two stages, the first stage is taking place now in Stockholm, while the subsequent stage will take place in 1986 in Vienna, where the countries will have to check on the fulfillment of those obligations adopted at the present session, at the Stockholm session.

So now, during the discussion of the issue of confidence-building measures, the United States is making proposals that have been christened transparency measures at this conference. What lies behind this? The United States is now proposing several such measures that would effectively create the possibility of carrying out active reconnaissance against the defensive systems primarily of the Warsaw Pact countries.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, but the intention is that these same measures will also be applied to the NATO countries.

[Zamyatin] Correct; they will also be used against the NATO countries. But the clever part of the American maneuver lies in the fact that the United States does not fall within the scope of this transparency. The countries are discussing several measures that should protect against a possible threat of sudden attack or measures that would prevent some kind of false data that might indicate that an attack was being prepared. In order to bypass all of this and to create confidence-building measures in some way, it has been proposed at the conference that there should be discussion of extending measures like the notification of major troop movements in Europe by different countries; and notification of major maneuvers, not just on land, but in the air and in the seas around Europe; and so on. That is to say, these are notification measures that encourage the creation of a definite atmosphere of confidence and trust.

But the Soviet delegation went further. It stated that confidence-building measures ought to be examined in a broader context, not just within a narrow military-technical context about which we have just been speaking in our discussion. The Soviet delegation made two major proposals, the adoption of which would indeed create an atmosphere of trust among the countries taking part in this conference. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov spoke about them in detail in his replies to PRAVDA on 25 January. He named these measures: first, the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, that is to say a country pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If, say, the United States -- which is also talking a great deal about confidence now -- were to make this kind of pledge, as has been done by the Soviet Union unilaterally, it is perfectly clear that there would be neither a first nor a second nuclear strike. Would that lead to a weakening of confidence in Europe or **throughout** the whole world? No, of course it would gain in strength.

The second proposal that Yuriy Vladimirovich made, which was also presented by our delegation in Stockholm, was the Warsaw Pact countries' proposal that there should be no use of military force to solve disputes that may arise; in other words that an agreement on the non-use of military force be signed the two blocs. What would this mean? If military force is not used to solve disputes, then a broad prospect and path open up for talks on substantial, concrete issues, and trust will be increased. This is what we brought with us to the Stockholm conference and what we presented on the part of the Soviet Union as a constructive proposal enabling practical work to be carried out now to draw up large-scale confidence-building and security measures for Europe.

Gromyko, Shultz Meetings

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, letters in our mailbag mention the contacts that Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko had while he was in Stockholm with the representatives of a number of Western countries, and in particular with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. The writers of these letters ask us to say what these contacts have led to and what has been the result.

[Zamyatin] Well, you know that many people were waiting for that meeting. They were waiting for it because the last meeting between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and Secretary of State Shultz, which took place last September, was held, as everyone knows, in an atmosphere that had been made very tense by the Reagan administration. In fact that meeting produced no positive results at all. Many people thought, therefore, that this latest meeting between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and the U.S. secretary of state would provide an opportunity for a certain amount of dialogue on Soviet-U.S. relations and problems of international relations. According to the press reports in both our newspapers and American newspapers, that is exactly how the meeting turned out. They discussed both a range of Soviet-U.S. relations and a whole number of international problems. However, since, as Shultz said, it had been agreed that the meeting would be confidential, he declined to make any statements to the press on the substance and the nature of the questions that were the subject of discussion between the two foreign ministers. I have to say, however, that very many rumors were going around that the meeting might to some degree supplant the talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, which had been taking place in Geneva and which, as you know, were wrecked by the United States.

[Zorin] People are saying that a step has been made in that direction.

[Zamyatin] The reason for this sort of rumor was a speech made by Reagan on the eve of the Stockholm meeting in which, as journalists point out, he used the words peace, peace-loving, peaceful relations, and so forth, 35 times; and he himself said that it was a speech about Soviet-U.S. dialogue. I have to say that, of course, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's meeting with Shultz in Stockholm did in no way, nor could it, supplant the talks that were being held in Geneva and that the United States wrecked, as everyone knows, by adopting the stance of deploying nuclear missile weaponry in Europe, and not of holding talks.

I should like to stress one thing that was mentioned in the interview with Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. When Reagan says that he proposes that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue be continued, that he is, so to speak, ready for such a dialogue, and that he thinks that the door in Geneva is open for talks to be continued on medium-range missiles, then the question arises; What else is new in the U.S. position? When you take a look at Reagan's speech, and when you analyze everything that was said about Shultz's talks with Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, you cannot help coming to the same conclusion, that nothing new can be seen in the U.S. position on the medium-range missiles. That is why particular stress was laid in the interview given by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov on the idea that if there is going to be any talk of resuming the Geneva talks on medium-range nuclear weapons, then the United States must, first and foremost, return to the orginal situation -- in other words to the situation whereby medium-range missiles were not stationed in the FRG, Great Britain and, as they are now, in Sicily. Why do we say this? Because those very talks in Geneva -- and the Soviet side has said this many times -- were conceived as talks on limiting and reducing medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

In fact, however -- and I should like to point this out -- Shultz, in reply to a question from a correspondent as to whether this subject had been touched upon during his talks with Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, said, and essentially admitted, that the subject had been touched upon, but that there were no changes in the U.S. position and that it remained the same.

When he was asked to formulate the United States views as the essence of that position, Mr Shultz, as the U.S. press says, had to admit that it was not even the Americans' aim at the talks in Geneva to reach an agreement whereby the U.S. missiles would not be stationed in Europe. Shultz said that during the talks in Geneva it was purely a matter of how to bargain with the Russians over the level at which the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles would be stationed.

So now it turns out we have it confirmed yet again that we were right in concluding that at Geneva the United States had no desire even to implement the second part of the NATO decision -- in other words, talks. They worked to implement the first part -- the ungrading of armaments. They carried it out, and are continuing to act in the same spirit. So, to say that this subject was somehow touched upon in Stockholm and that the door is now open for these talks, well, until the condition that we spoke of, the just condition of a return to the original situation with regard to the medium-range missiles, is fulfilled, there can be no talks. Why? Because if there were, this would mean that we would be participating in the game that the United States has embarked on -- putting missiles near the borders of the Soviet Union and holding dialogue from a position of strength. In fact Reagan has said that strength and dialogue should go hand in hand, and that is how he sees dialogue with the Soviet Union. Yuriy Vladimirovich stressed, however, in his replies to PRAVDA that it is senseless to count on conducting power diplomacy with us. We ourselves do not go in for such diplomacy, and we will not allow anyone to conduct such diplomacy with us.

To sum up, I want to say that the talks themselves, or more precisely the conversation between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and Shultz, was, naturally, useful because it provided an opportunity for discussion of the points that each side thought necessary to set forth at those talks. But I want to draw the attention of our viewers to the fact that the communique on this conversation, which was published in the Soviet press, quite clearly says that during this conversation Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko clearly set out our assessment of U.S. policy as the main reason for the tension that exists and the danger of nuclear confrontations in Europe and the world as a whole. Mr Shultz was told quite clearly about this; and this was recorded in our final communique on this conversation.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, our viewers who have sent letters to 'Studio 9' have drawn attention to a certain change of tone, if one may put it that way, in Washington recently. Even the attempts in the U.S. mass media to comment on Andrey Andreyevich's meeting in Stockholm with Shultz can be described as more balanced than has been the case up to now. This applies, above all, to the speech made by Reagan about Soviet-U.S. relations, which you have already mentioned. Reagan spoke for 24 minutes; and, indeed, during those 24 minutes he used the word peace in various ways over 35 times. So, what do you think: What lies behind this adjustment of tone? Is there any serious content in it? What does it all mean?

[Zamyatin] It seems to me that in this respect Reagan wants, above all, to inject a certain cosmetic element, I would say, into Soviet-U.S. relations, in view of the forthcoming election campaign in the United States. Why? Because Soviet-U.S. relations and the conduct of talks with the Soviet Union will undoubtedly become a central issue in the U.S. election camapaign, whether Reagan likes it or not. What is the second reason that on 16 January Reagan suddenly made this speech totally devoted, allegedly, to the need to resume the Soviet-U.S. dialogue? The reason for this is that this militaristic and hostile rhetoric to which Reagan has resorted for the last 3 years and which has been echoed by all his associates, who have not been outdone in either words, expressions or falsifications of the facts, has resulted in a situation in which the U.S. press has itself said that Reagan has become a master at whipping up hysteria.

This hysteria has led to fear among Americans and Europeans. Now Reagan wants to reassure public opinion somehow and show another side of himself, or at least to try to show himself as peacemaker, a person who loves peace.

But to evaluate this speech, one needs to look, first and foremost, at what lies behind these peace-loving words. Are there any specific proposals aimed at changing the nature of Soviet-U.S. relations, at improving them? If one analyzes recent U.S. documents, including Reagan's speech, one can see that there is nothing new in Reagan's approach to Soviet-U.S. relations, except words. But the U.S. position must be judged not by words but by deeds. There is no need to convince us of the necessity for a Soviet-U.S. dialogue. After all, this is our policy; and we have adhered to this policy throughout all the years of our relations with the United States. It is the Reagan administration and Reagan's team, his closest associates so to speak, who have done their utmost in 3 years to ruin what was done by predecessors to improve these relations. Now they are reaching for words, talking about talks, talking about dialogue. But there is nothing specific, nothing behind this. This is another deception of public opinion.

'Violations' of SALT II

[Zorin] Here is another subject, Leonid Mitrofanovich. Allegations have been circulating in Washington that the Soviet Union has violated the provisions of the SALT I and SALT II treaties. What is more, this campaign, these accusations against us, have coincided -- I do not know whether it is accidental or not -- have coincided with these deliberately peace-loving declarations about which you and I have been speaking. On the one hand these declarations are made; on the other hand we are accused of violating the SALT I and SALT II treaties. What can you say about this?

[Zamyatin] You know, these questions are related very closely to each other. This is because Reagan now wants to prove that the blame for the destabilization of the situation in Europe and the world rests on the Soviet Union, which, he says, is not only arming itself and striving to outstrip the United States in the arms race but is also failing to fulfill agreements that have been concluded with the United States. So, how can one trust such a country the argument runs. That is the implication of such delcarations by Reagan. Even after Reagan's speech, about which we spoke, the peace-loving, peacemaking speech, in quotation marks, Reagan sent Congress a report. It was described as a highly secret report. But, as is always the case with this administration, even before the secrets reach the threshold of Congress from the White House, the press published very detailed summaries of these reports. These documents are leaked by the administration itself. So, Reagan forwarded a report saying that the Soviet Union had recently violated a number of major agreements. For example, Reagan said that the Soviet Union may -- see how it is worded -- have violated the SALT II treaty.

Well, in the first place, the Soviet Union has never violated agreements it has signed; and I want to say this quite definitely. In our foreign policy, adherence to treaties and agreements is an elementary truth in international relations. Unfortunately, this elementary truth has not been learned in the White House. They violate one agreement after another. We have considerable evidence that we can cite to prove this conclusion. After all, the SALT II treaty was violated from the start by the United States. This is because, having signed the treaty on behalf of the state, having placed the U.S. President's signature on it, they did not ratify it. There you have the first violation, so to speak, of the very essence of the treaty. If this treaty had been ratified by 1 January 1981, the level, the overall level, of strategic armaments would have been reduced on both sides to 2,400 units. This process would have been continued. The level would already have been lowered to 2,250 units. But it was precisely this process that did not suit the United States.

Now I will talk about the violations -- examples of violations, to be more accurate -- by the United States of that treaty, which was not ratified, but which is being observed by the Soviet Union and should be observed by the United States. But what has Reagan done? In the first place, he has now put the mighty MX missile into production. To this the Reagan administration has added a further 1,000 single warhead Midgetman missiles, the aim of which is to break down the defenses of the enemy, the Soviet Union. I have already said the U.S. Armed Forces will be equipped with 1,000 of these missiles in the next few years. That is the first major violation of the SALT II treaty for you.

Has the Soviet Union violated the SALT II treaty? No. I can prove this by the fact that a Soviet-U.S. commission, which meets from time to time to study the claims of one side or the other of violations of the SALT I treaty and, of other agreements arising from it, still exists. It was at this commission that accusations made by the American side were continually examined. The Soviet representatives cited specific data that refuted the American claims. But is anything of this mentioned in the report to Congress? Nothing of the kind; all this is passed over in silence. This is how the Reagan administration falsifies documents. What for? It does this to create an atmosphere of war hysteria, to turn U.S. public opinion against the Soviet Union, to create the psychological mood in the United States itself and among the United States' allies, which Reagan himself called psychological warfare against the Soviet Union.

[Zorin] Such a report may be designed simply to, as the saying goes, lay one's own fault at someone else's door.

[Zamyatin] As Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko said in his speech at the Stockholm conference, these claims of the Soviet Union's violation of the treaties and agreements signify that Reagan would like to cover up his own sins by means of this report.

Soviet-Japanese Relations

[Zorin] Another group of questions, Leonid Mitrofanovich: Engineer Lebedev from Chita, Comrade Nikitenko, a worker from Tomsk, and a whole group of other viewers ask us to speak about the present state of Soviet-Japanese relations.

[Zamyatin] Allow me briefly to dwell on this question. I would note three points characterizing Soviet-Japanese relations and the state of relations with Japan in general. On the one hand, I recall two statements by Japanese Foreign Minister Abe, in which he said that Japan would like to have good-neighborly, normal relations with the Soviet Union; and to restore the previous volume of trade, which, in the last few years, has been substantially reduced on the Japanese side, inasmuch as Japan has, especially in the past year, joined the American policy of sanctions. You know that Reagan elevated this into a policy of declaring sanctions against the Soviet Union or against other socialist countries over the slightest thing. So Japan joined these sanctions against the Soviet Union. Now, true, many Japanese business circles are saying: Is it not time for Japan to pursue its own policy in this matter and renounce this process of NATOization of Japan? Such a term has now been invented. It emerged in connection with the fact that Japan, in the words of Premier Nakasone, has declared that it feels bound by ties to NATO and in the overall security system virtually regards itself as part of NATO.

[Zorin] However, Leonid Mitrofanovich, Premier Nakasone paid dearly for that in the last elections.

[Zamyatin] The militarization of the Japanese economy, the rebirth of the army, purchases of military equipment from the United States; all this has led to the fact that this military policy, linked with sharp pressure from the United States on Japan to turn it into an unsinkable aircraft carrier for the American armed forces, plus the revived Japanese armed forces and American equipment, plus Japanese equipment, all this has led to the fear of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the fear of militarization of the country itself, being revived among the Japanese public. And when the additional elections started in December, in the lower chamber of the Japanese parliament, Nakasone's party suffered a defeat. Fewer votes for him meant that he failed to get 36 places, and stayed in power only because he formed a bloc with the so-called independent party and with another group. In this way he again secured a majority in the Japanese parliament and emerged once more at the head of the government of Japan.

I should like to stress with this example that Japan is now on a dangerous road, a road of militarization of the economy and of following in the wake of American policy in the Far East. This policy could lead to Japan violating the country's constitution which restricts the revival of the Japanese army, and to a sharp growth of military production in Japan, and hence, so to speak, also to the creation of a Japanese threat alongside the American threat in the Far East to neighboring countries.

I have mentioned two points that characterize the state of Soviet-Japanese relations and that are reflected in these relations. I should like to say that the first -- the course of good-neighborly relations -- is in every way supported and will continue to be supported by the Soviet Union. We know that Japan is a reliable trade partner. We know that Japan borders on the Soviet Union and that our relations, as was the case in the past, can be restored in full, but this to a considerable degree is hampered by that policy, the policy of militarization, of anti-Soviet hysteria, which is enflamed both by American circles in Japan and by certain militaristic circles in Japan itself.

PRC Policies, Zhao Trip

[Zorin] Thank you. Another group of letters. It is devoted to the visit made by Premier of the Chinese State Council Zhao Ziyang to the United States and Canada. The writers of the letters we have received ask us to dwell on the aims and outcome of that visit, Leonid Mitrofanovich.

[Zamyatin] Both sides had an interest in the visit. I must say right from the beginning that this is the first visit of the Premier of the PRC State Council to the United States. The Chinese side pursued the achievement of economic aims during the visit and the promotion of a whole number of economic and scientific-technical projects in whose implementation it had an interest. While in the United States, Zhao Ziyang repeatedly stressed that the PRC Government was now conducting an open-door policy, and that the doors that were open for American exporters to the PRC would not be closed. He made this absolutely clear to all American business, that here was a field for the application of American capital and for the export of goods necessary to China. It is a question of purchases of industrial output and the development of commercial and economic relations in this sphere, and also scientific-technical documentation in many spheres.

What was the U.S. interest? The United States and Reagan first of all tried to use this visit to stress -- under conditions in which a campaign of anti-Sovietism continues from time to time in China -- Reagan, playing on this, considered he would be able to stress during the visit the existence of an American-Chinese strategic partnership. He spoke about this in his speeches several times, as if trying to persuade Zhao Ziyang to say something in response.

It has to be said that Zhao Ziyang did not make a direct confirmation of the existence of a strategic partnership between the United States and the PRC. He said that China carries out its own line. At the same time it has to be noted that the speeches of Zhao Ziyang contained some points that make it clear that the United States and China have common tasks and interest in such questions as their attitudes to Kampuchea, where, as is known, China supports Sihanouk and the remnants of the band of the Pol Pot leadership which claims power, or at least a piece of Kampuchean territory on which it can create a semblance of some kind of government-in-exile and carry out aggressive actions agains the legitimate government of Kampuchea.

The second topic on which Zhao Ziyang made quite clear statements and on which American and Chinese interests and appraisals coincide was Afghanistan. And it is characteristic that the bans of interventionists that are on the territory of Pakistan and that carry out aggression against Afghanistan from outside, from Pakistani territory, they, as it turns out -- and this was no secret for us, it was just confirmed by these statements -- they are supported both by the United States and by China. So, that is where the arms are coming from, that is where the advisers come from, that is where the whole direction of this policy against People's Afghanistan comes from. These are very characteristic points that come out during this visit

[Zorin] On the other hand, Leonid Mitrofanovich, Zhao Ziyang stressed that China condemns U.S. policy in the Near East and toward Grenada; that kind of note was to be heard in what he said.

[Zamyatin] That is correct. He stated that. However, not in as sharp a form as was necessary, so to speak, from the viewpoint of condemning aggression, say, in Grenada. It seems to me -- and this is my point of view -- that these statements reflect China's policy, but the fact that they were heard in such a weak form in the speeches made on U.S. territory, indicates that they were made more for the Third World which was looking at China's position during this visit.

[Zorin] But the press reported differences during this visit between the Reagan leadership and Zhao Ziyang on the Taiwan question, Leonid Mitrofanovich.

[Zamyatin] That is true. The Chinese Government used Zhao Ziyang's visit to repeatedly set out before the American public and the U.S. Administration the PRC viewpoint that there cannot be two Chinas. Zhao Ziyang stated directly that Taiwan must be an integral part of China. It might be, so to speak, one of the territorial units of China, which, to a certain extent, will be autonomous on a number of issues. But the fact that it belongs to China must not be disputed by anyone. This line was set out quite precisely during the stay of Zhao Ziyang.

Europe's Ties With USSR, U.S.

[Zorin] Thank you. Here is another group of letters. Comrade (Dinevich) from Kishinev, a patriotic war veteran; Comrade (Degtarev) from the Volgograd Oblast; (Kuzvanov) from Shadrinski; and many other comrades raise the question of relations between the Soviet Union and countries of Western Europe that have accepted the deployment of U.S. missiles on their territory. Is this step taken by these countries reflected in our relations?

[Zamyatin] Of course it is reflected. It is perfectly clear, and we have already spoken about this at the beginning of our talk, that it is one thing to develop relations under conditions of detente, and another thing when U.S. missiles directed against the Soviet Union and against the socialist countries have been placed on the territory of a number of European countries. Under these conditions we must develop relations with countries that have missiles aimed at us. Of course, this takes in a wide range of political relations among states, and it is reflected in economic relations. It is, therefore, beyond argument that the whole process begun by the United States -- the deployment of the U.S. nuclear weapons, a process aimed at creating an aggravated situation in Europe -- is reflected in mutual relations between the countries of Europe and the countries of the socialist community.

[Zorin] But we are continuing trade.

[Zamyatin] Yes, we are continuing to trade; but it is one thing to trade under conditions in which relations are tranquil, and something else to trade when tension is growing through the fault of the United States. What is more, as far as trade is concerned, I would note that the United States wants to increase this tension to make trade relations between the Soviet Union and West European countries more complicated. Why? It is to their advantage, because that way the United States hopes to solve its own economic affairs. It is weakening the countries of Western Europe as competitors of the U.S. economy. It is taking a number of measures that are changing the rates of exchange of the currencies of Western European countries. This year, and the year has hardly begun, the dollar literally threw the exchanges of the FRG, Great Britain and France into confusion and changed rates to the disadvantage of those countries. The flow of currency from West European countries to the United States continues, and the United States wants to use this to solve its own economic problems. What will happen to Western Europe is now of no concern to Reagan. His reelection is the important thing, as is some increase in the U.S. economic development index through an outflow of capital from West European industry. How is this done? Interest rates are raised in the United States, the rate becomes more advantageous, and there is an outflow of capital from Europe automatically to the place where it is advantageous to invest it. Reagan is quite indifferent to the fact that local industry in the West European countries is suffering and that markets are suffering because of this. This area is indeed an area of immense contradictions between the United States and its NATO allies.

U.S. Campaign; Candidates

[Zorin] You have just touched upon the issue of the U.S. election campaign, and I would like to use the time we have left to ask you to reply to those viewers who write about the election campaign and ask who, in our opinion, will ultimately confront each other in the fight for the White House in the autumn; and will the election campaign that has started in the United States be reflected in that country's foreign policy?

[Zamyatin] We have already said on more than one occasion that the election campaign is already entering the primary election stage. It is expected that Reagan will announce on 29 January that he is going to run for reelection. He intends to campaign under the slogan: Reagan-Bush 84. Why has there been a delay in Reagan's nomination? This, too, is something not without interest. They say that Reagan finally decided to bury the evidence of the theft of the documents from the Democratic Party during the previous election campaign.

Well, now the U.S. press writes that the resignation several days ago of Attorney General Smith, who was Reagan's personal friend and who was involved in the investigation into this theft, will, as it were, conclude this matter once and for all; and that Reagan is now free to announce his candidacy for the Presidency without fearing that the Democratic Party can somehow make use of this fact against him.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party approaches the beginning of these primary elections with eight candidates putting themselves forward for the post of president. They are: Mondale, who heads the list; Glenn, Hart, Hollings and a number of other people whom I will not enumerate here. The only person who, in my view, deserves to be mentioned today, is Jesse Jackson. He represents the Negro community of the United States and if he continues to put his candidacy forward several million Negro votes which, usually, are cast for the Democratic Party, will, in fact, be drawn off by him and taken from the Democratic Party's main contender. But, for the time being, Democratic Party's candidates, in essence, are more opposed to one another than to Reagan. I wish to emphasize one element in the Democratic Party's election campaign. Recently, all the eight candidates held a televised discussion in which they set out their views on the future program of the Democratic Party and on the Democratic candidates for the election. It is natural, so to speak, that the U.S. economy should have been in the center of attention and no one said anything new here; however, a majority of candidates who now contend for the post of president on behalf of the Democrats came out in favor of nuclear arms freeze, and this is a very characteristic fact; one which now reflects the general mood in the United States.

Allow me, by way of corroborating this fact, to cite the statements of the Gallup Institute which does public opinion polls. Toward the end of the year, this institute carried out a public opinion poll and reported that 37 percent of those polled stated that the main cause of their alarm was the threat of war and the tense international situation, while 32 percent opted for unemployment and 11 percent for inflation.

By way of comparison, it ought to be recalled that in October 1982 just 6 percent of those polled expressed anxiety over the growing threat of war, while 62 percent considered unemployment and 18 percent considered inflation to be the main problem. What does this show? It testifies to the fact that the questions of foreign policy and the questions of war and peace will be in the center of attention of the election campaign in the United States. And it is not only the Democrats who take this into consideration; Republicans, too, have begun to take it into consideration and this, so to speak, confirms yet again what we talked about at the beginning of our conversation. Why is it all of a sudden Reagan began to come out with such peace-loving speeches? Because he foresaw that this question would be in the center of the election campaign. Replying to our viewer's question about whether the election campaign can impinge on the process of forming U.S. foreign policy, well this is how I understand this question: Can U.S. foreign policy change now, during the election campaign, especially toward the Soviet Union, toward the arms race and so forth? I think not.

The election campaign can influence these processes, but to expect that there will now be a radical change in this position of the Reagan administration, under the influence of the election campaign is, I think, groundless, since Reagan started up this war machine and now reckons that he can continue to carry on with international relations from a position of force. But how the American voters will appraise this is another question.

[Zorin] Well, thank you. All that remains for me to do is to thank you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, for the detailed answers to our viewers' questions; to thank our viewers for their attention. Until we meet here again on "Studio 9", thank you.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD291915 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 20 Jan 84

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, all-union radio foreign affairs commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST magazine]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello, comrades. The participants in our round table gathering today are Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board ot the NOVOYE VREMYA weekly, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST Magazine.

Andropov, Reagan Statements

Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to questions from PRAVDA which were published this week, have attracted, as you know, enormous attention from the world public, and the reason for this is understandable. After all, the Soviet leader touched upon problems that continue to concern every honest person who is anxious about the exceptionally alarming international situation. Replying to the question of whether the world has become safer, as Washington and NATO claim, Comrade Andropov stated outright that there are no grounds for such a conclusion, since the main causes for the dangerous tension in the world have not been removed. It is clearly pointed out once again that the responsibility for the present situation in the international arena lies first and foremost with the U.S. Administration, which is continuing its adventurist policy in Europe, the Near East, Central America and other areas of the globe. Regarding the U.S. President's recent pronouncement in favor of a Soviet-American dialogue, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov clearly and precisely defined the character and purposes of such a dialogue. It needs to be conducted on an equal basis and honestly in an effort to achieve specific accords, and not, for example, in the way that the U.S. representatives behaved toward the Geneva negotiations, where for almost 2 years they were, so to speak, beating the air and providing a cover for Washington, which meanwhile was preparing in practice for the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in West Europe. In this connection, Comrade Andropov emphasized that we will judge by practical deeds whether the United States has a serious intention of conducting a dialogue with us.

The Soviet leader recalled that our country has put forward a broad range of specific proposals and initiatives aimed at consolidating peace and international security. These proposals and initiatives remain in force. If, for instance, the United States undertook, as our country has done, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, this would already have a substantial effect on the international climate and on the atmosphere of Soviet-American relations. The degree of trust in Europe and indeed throughout the world would be really enhanced by the agreement of the NATO countries to the proposal of the Warsaw Treaty participants that military force should not be used against each other. A solution to the problem of averting an arms race in space cannot be postponed, Comrade Andropov said. Given readiness on the West's part, it would be possible to set about a practical solution of the matters under discussion at the Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

As part of a set of measures directed at lessening the threat of war, the Soviet Union is initially proposing to the United States a simple and at the same time fairly effective step -- that nuclear arms be frozen. There ought to be a stepping up of efforts aimed at the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on their substantial limitation and radical reduction. The achievement of accord on these issues, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov emphasized, needs, first and foremost, the desire and the political will on the part of the United States and the other NATO countries.

[Nekrasov] Regarding this desire and political will, Boris Vasilyevich, I would like to return to those words of President Reagan, which you cited, saying that the world has become safer. I would like to return to them because this is not the only statement of this kind. There has been a whole series of statements, talks and interviews of various sorts. The latest example indeed has been the so-called State of the Union message, which the U.S. President delivers in January each year to Congress, giving an assessment of the state of affairs both in the United States and throughout the world.

[Volskiy] We have here the text of the message that Reagan delivered on the evening of 25 January. I shall quote what the President says in the section devoted to the international situation: a durable and lasting peace is our firm and great aim; our hands are clean; Americans resort to force only when they are compelled to do so. These are fine words.

[Nekrasov] Yes, they are fine words, but, honestly speaking, they are completely at variance with reality. It seems that there are, of course, considerations behind all the pronouncements of this kind. In actual fact, as I said, the situation in the world is alarming and dangerous, and this was stated quite clearly and precisely in Comrade Andropov's replies. The nuclear threat has increased. The appearance of American missiles in West Europe is increasing not only military tension but also political tension. Interstate relations too have become affected by this tension.

[Volskiy] In general all the U.S. Administration's actions show that it has no thought of an honest and equal dialogue with the Soviet Union, but is attempting to speak only for its own demagogic considerations, which are obviously pre-election considerations in the main.

[Nekrasov] Of course, they are not thinking of any such thing. Well, widespread publicity is still being given in the United States to President Reagan's 16 January speech, the so-called speech about dialogue with the Soviet Union. This was discussed in the sections of Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's interview with PRAVDA that were cited by Boris Vasilyevich. In this connection, I would like to note yet again that in contrast to our specific, clear, and distinct position, the Americans position on dialogue, firstly, is that it must be conducted in parallel with the possession of a position of strength by the United States. Secondly, no specific proposals are made to the Soviet side about measure of one kind or another that might help to ease the present acute tension. At the same time provocative actions, aimed at maintaining tension at a high level, are undertaken. You have obviously heard about the report submitted to Congress, which is secret at the moment. This report deals with certain alleged violations by the Soviet Union of agreements and treaties with the United States -- the treaty on antimissile defense and the agreement known as the first agreement on strategic arms limitation. They are trying to accuse our country of violating the conditions of this agreement, though even informed U.S. journalists, who have evidently had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with this secret document, say that the arguments used in it and the cases mentioned in it are very dubious. In any case, this is not a subject for a propaganda campaign. It is a subject for discussion between the two countries. Meanwhile, talk is already beginning in the U.S. Senate to the effect that these agreements and treaties with the Soviet Union could be abrogated on the basis of this report. So, you see, on the one hand there are mild words and talk about dialogue. And, on the other hand, there are already specific measures to eliminate existing agreements that restrain the U.S. side to a certain extent.

'Responsibility' of Deployment

[Andrianov] It seems to me to be important, Vadim Nikolayevich, to draw attention to yet another point noted in Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's answers to the questions from PRAVDA. I have in mind the section that speaks about the responsibility borne for the current dangerous turn of events by the governments of other NATO countries, in addition to that borne by the United States.

This applies, above all, to those governments that have now made their countries territory available for the deployment of new U.S. missiles. These governments are, as you know, those of Britain, the FRG and Italy that have acted in defiance of the clearly expressed wishes of their own peoples.

[Nekrasov] I think, Boris Vasilyevich, that the time has come to speak firmly and unreservedly about the serious responsibility that the ruling circles of those countries have assumed. I think that what Neil Kinnock, the leader of the British Labour Party, had to say to the British Government was absolutely justified. He said that, by your actions you have stabbed the Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe in the back. What was that a reference to? What does "stabbed in the back" mean? It means that they have voluntarily opted to deploy the missiles -- and what's more, ahead of schedule. After all, according to the letter of the 1979 NATO decision, the NATO council was supposed to examine first the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks and then to take a decision on whether to counterarm, as they call it in the West, or not to counterarm. But they did not bother to wait for the NATO session. Instead they hurried ahead with the consent, the voluntary consent, of the governments in Bonn, London and Rome. Indeed, the governments of the FRG, Britain and Italy did not heed the wishes of their peoples on such an important issue as the question of preventing war. Furthermore, they resorted to force in order to deal with popular demonstrations. But such a thing cannot be done without leaving a trace. Van Mierlo, the former Netherlands Defense Minister, spoke quite eloquently about this. He said: either democracy will destroy nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons will destroy democracy. And now we can see how these missiles that have appeared on European soil are now beginning to destroy democracy. So, the British THE GUARDIAN newspaper was right to note: it was thought that the cruise missiles and Pershings were supposed to defend freedom and democracy, but instead of that our governments are defending the missile bases from their own peoples. In the Western countries we are now living in a state of semiwar, in which certain conventional democratic principles are no longer functioning. That is the situation to which the deployment of the missiles has led.

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, we have said quite a lot today about the internal problems of the West European countries. But in the United States these problems are being exacerbated at the moment because of the approaching presidential elections, which are now quite close.

[Nekrasov] Yes, indeed, in a month's time either election meetings or the so-called primaries, that is preliminary voting in connection with the nomination of candidates for the presidential elections, will begin in individual states. As far as the Republican Party is concerned, this question is no longer an issue. Nobody is excited about who will be the candidate. It is absolutely clear. We now know that it will be Reagan.

As far as the Democratic Party candidates are concerned, there will be a struggle between them. What is typical today? The latest public opinion poll conducted in America shows that Reagan's victory in those elections is far from guaranteed. Thus, the Gallup Institute, which is most authoritative on these issues, has calculated that Reagan has on his side the staunch support of approximately 38 percent of the electorate: 35 percent of the electorate are now his equally staunch opponents. This is a total of 75 percent, leaving 27 percent of the electorate who are undecided. It is for them that the struggle will be waged, and quite a tough struggle, at that, and the issues of war and peace, as the American press clearly stresses, will represent the principal base for such a struggle. The American press says that for the first time in the postwar period it is not bread and butter issues, that, not issues pertaining to the internal economic situation, but issues pertaining to the internal situation, to the international situation existing today which presents a threat, that are more and more at the forefront of the awareness of the Americans.

Aims of Zhao's U.S. Visit

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you have talked here about the election campaign which is commencing in the United States, about Reagan's electoral calculations. The visit to the United States by Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang, which ended 2 weeks ago, is also to some extent connected with this. Such a view has been expressed by many foreign press organs. For instance, this is what the West German Paper WESTFAELISCHE RUNDSCHAU said about Zhao Ziyang's visit -- I quote: The visit is important to Reagan above all as an opportunity to improve relations with Beijing, so as to make political capital out of it in the year of the presidential elections. Developing the same theme, the American paper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL pointed out in addition that in election year Reagan is striving to gain advantages from his trip to China due to take place in April. And Washington is now trying in every way to elevate both Zhao Ziyang's visit and the American President's forthcoming visit as a clear achievement of the foreign policy of the White House boss in relations with China. Such an importunate presentation is particularly striking at the present time, if one recalls that only a year or so ago the two visits were still in question.

[Volskiy] In the course of the whole of last year the Reagan Administration made attempts, some more noticeable, some less so, to gratify the Beijing leadership.

[Andrianov] In this way the White House showed that it was interested in the Chinese premier paying a visit to the United States and the American President paying a reciprocal visit to China. To all appearance China sensed, of course, such an interest on the part of Washington and decided to use it to its own ends, to obtain from the United States the maximum possible in the economic sphere. You know, of course, that during Zhao Ziyang's visit two important agreements were signed, agreements on industrial and scientific and technological cooperation. They are, as Reagan said, to stimulate the part played by private American capital in the economic development of China; in short, this is a stepping-up of Chinese-American relations in the sphere of trade, science, technology and economic cooperation. As is known, Beijing several years ago proclaimed a policy of open doors, and in the course of his visit, Zhao Ziyang announced that China had opened its door and will never close it. This met with loud approval on the part of the American hosts. It is understandable why, since the United States monopolies have already outstripped their competitors from other Western countries regarding direct capital investments in the Chinese economy, and after the agreements signed during Zhao Ziyang's visit the opportunities in China for the businessmen over the ocean will considerably increase in this respect.

The mutually beneficial character of expanding American-Chinese cooperation was discussed during Zhao Ziyang's visit. It is to be supposed that Beijing sees that it can benefit from wider opportunities for a more speedy economic development of the country that will arise from the influx of American capital and the use of the industrial, scientific and technological experience of the United States. Transatlantic business will not come off a loser either, of course. The bosses of the monopolies will receive quite considerable, and moreover, guaranteed profits in China where, apart from everything else, on the basis of the agreements signed, they will be in a strong position to elbow aside and squeeze their competitors from other capitalist countries. This is, however, only the economic aspect of the advantage which Washington is striving to achieve in China. And, after all, one can suppose, the White House first and foremost had a different aspect in mind, a political aspect. Counting on making the Chinese economy dependent to the greatest possible extent on the world capitalist economy, Washington, to all appearances, intends subsequently to use this factor to stimulate and encourage the tendencies in Beijing's domestic and foreign policy which it finds convenient.

On what are such calculations of the Reagan administration based? Probably on the peculiarities of the present foreign course of the Chinese leadership which are reflected, in particular, in the fact that the present exacerbation of the international situation, caused by Washington's militarist course, has had no significant, negative influence on the mechanism of the existing links between China and the United States.

Beijing has failed to put out a single statement which might have been evidence that it differs from Washington as regards some of the most important questions of principle of the present time, questions such as detente, arms control and disarmament, the reasons for the present increase in international tension.

[Volskiy] However, Boris Vasilyevich, this is only one side of the question. When in the United States, the Chinese premier strived in his utterances to let it be understood -- he even emphasized this -- that Beijing is keeping itself at a considerable distance from certain aggressive manifestations of Washington's foreign policy course. For example, he spoke of the difference in the positions of the two countries on the Near East issue; as regards the situation in Central America he noted China's difference of opinion on the U.S. incursion into Grenada, isn't that right?

[Andrianov] Yes, of course that's right. Beijing criticizes Washington on certain problems that do not touch on China's strictly national interests. However, this criticism will never develop into a critical analysis of the whole of imperialist policy in the world arena as a whole, of the whole aggressive, militarist course of the U.S. Administration, which is the source of the present, extremely acute tension in the international situation. Further, Zhao Ziyang confirmed to Washington, for example, the similarity in approach of China and United States to the problems of Afghanistan and Kampuchea. In this matter the Chinese premier reiterated many times that there exist three so-called major obstacles which stand in the way, according to him, of the normalization of relations between China and the Soviet Union. Washington propaganda eagerly circulated the utterances of Zhao Ziyang concerning the so-called inequality of the Russian-Chinese treaties which established the boundary between the two states.

This all forces attention to be turned to the fact that the views of Washington and Beijing coincide in precisely those places where the forces of imperialism and reaction are fighting particularly actively against the forces of socialism and progress. And this is also favorable for the attempts of the Reagan administration to attach an anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist trend to U.S.-Chinese relations.

Washington has need of this in order to realize its militaristic plans and to change for its benefit the correlation of forces in the world, to aggravate still further the international situation. Does China need this, however? Indeed the sharp edge of the present course of the Reagan administration concerning China is, in essence, directed also against the genuine, national interests of the Chinese people.

Near East, C. America Issues

[Volskiy] I would like to go back to the replies of Comrade Andropov to the questions put by PRAVDA, and dwell on what is said there concerning the Near East. Among other things, Comrade Andropov stressed that at present U.S. soldiers, too, along with Israeli forces, are fighting the Arabs.

All this creates a qualitatively new situation in comparison with what existed even a few months ago, especially since U.S. forces and vessels participate directly in the fighting in Lebanon, firing on the positions of national-patriotic forces. Last week this fire sometimes became more intensive, sometimes died down somewhat -- the calm before the storm, as THE WASHINGTON POST wrote. Evidently, it is no accident that this paper writes about the storm that is threatening Lebanon. Here it is easy to spot the interconnection with another event, with the first meeting of the U.S.-Israeli military committee that was recently set up. Here we have increasingly close coordination of military actions, military policy of the United States and Israel, and also this is not on staff maps, but directly on the long-suffering Lebanese territory.

[Nekrasov] Dmitriy Antonovich, the coordination of military actions of Israel and the United States in Lebanon is an obvious fact, and the report of the work of this committee merely confirms it. However it seems as though this coordination is being applied to an even broader region, too.

[Volskiy] Such plans do exist in any case. One must take into account that the meeting of this U.S.-Israeli committee took place in an atmosphere of secrecy. Only rumors filtered into the press about what precisely was discussed there -- the creation of American hospitals and bases in Israel, the possibility of joint maneuvers being held and so on. However, one report seems to me particularly alarming -- the report that Washington intends to include Israel in military planning on the southern flank of the North Atlantic bloc, that is in the eastern Mediterranean area, not far from the borders of the socialist community. It must be said that attempts in one form or another to draw Israel into NATO have been made for a long time. However, West European countries were against this, since they were frightened of angering and alienating the Arab oil states. Now, however, there is no longer a shortage of oil on the world market, rather there is a surplus. Consumers are inclined to take supplies less into account on the capitalist market, and therefore the West Europeans do not look on the Arab oil states in the same way as before. This facilitates the possibility of including Israel in NATO, not a formal inclusion of course, but a practical one, which Washington is seeking very persistently.

It is putting stronger and stronger pressure on its allies. It is now not enough for Washington that NATO's multinational forces are cooperating with Israeli interventionists in Lebanon. This is not enough. Washington also wants the Israeli military machine, as it were in payment for the support given by the Atlantic bloc in Lebanon, and let us say also in Siani, to act as some kind of a support for the already aggressive positions of NATO and the Pentagon in the east Mediterranean and to ensure a reliable rear from them on the south and southeast shore of the Mediterranean. This turn of events, I think, harbors a double threat. It turns out that any kind of aggressive action from Israel, especially of any large scale, can detonate the entire Mediterranean area with consequences to the cause of peace. And secondly, Israel can get involved in conflicts outside the Near East area and this is, of course, dangerous.

[Nekrosov] By these adventurist activities, the U.S. Administration once again repudiates its own false statements that nothing dangerous is happening in the world. These assertions were exposed in Comrade Andropov's replies to PRAVDA. He dealt in particular in this connection, as you remember, also with Central America where the U.S. Administration, as he said, encroaches upon the independence of sovereign states and wants, by force of weapons, to bring back the hated dictators.

[Volskiy] Yes. It could seem that Central America, the Caribbean Basin is further from the world's nerve centers than the Near East. Washington even considers it to be its backyard and acts there accordingly, especially high-handedly and cynically. But does the use of force bring success to the Americans?

They seized tiny Grenada, and it is not surprising as they used 7,000 selected soldiers and officers, the latest weapons, technology, the Navy again and so on. And yet without exaggeration, I say, Washington is suffering an obvious defeat in this region. The people of Nicaragua, at the cost of no small losses, invariably repulse gangs sent to them by CIA which are unable to snip off even a small piece of the territory of Nicaragua and install and implant there a puppet government. And this was precisely the original plan.

The absolute deadlock in which the Americans find themselves in El Salvador is particularly obvious. El Salvador is the very country that Reagan pledged 3 years ago to turn into a touchstone of the struggle against all liberation forces not only in Central America but also on a broader, global scale. And 3 years later, already one-third of the territory of El Salvador is under the control of patriotic rebel forces, and not only are they controlling it, but also they have been setting up governing bodies and developing offensives against other regions. Government troops are plainly unable by their own efforts to suppress the uprising, and scores of American military advisers are unable to help them. So in such a situation the Reagan administration faces a still sharper question -- to make a choice either in some form, to admit the inevitability of changes, or to use in El Salvador or even possibly in Nicaragua, its own regular troops to overthrow the regime of the Sandinists, the revolutionary regime, about which the Americans have been thinking for a long time.

[Nekrasov] Well, Dmitriy Antonovich, is it not obvious that if the Reagan administration should decide on direct intervention, it would inevitably meet with the resolute resistance of the peoples of Central America and it would get embroiled in a bloody and prolonged war.

[Volskiy] This is why Reagan's team is striving by various methods, with the help for example of promises of an allocation of large funds, $8.5 billion, for the development of Central America as recommended recently by the so-called Kissinger commission. This is why it is striving to postpone this choice. Especially bearing in mind the forthcoming presidential elections in the United States, about which we have already talked here today. And with this we shall end our broadcast. Thank you for your attention.

ANTARCTIC MINERAL RESOURCES PROTECTION MEETING

LD290020 Moscow TASS in English 2238 GMT 28 Jan 84

[Text] Washington January 28 TASS -- A session of the working group has been held here within the framework of a special consultative meeting on the mineral resources of the Antarctic. The session was attended by representatives of the 16 states -- parties to the Treaty on the Antarctic of 1959, including the USSR, Poland, the USA, Britain, France, Japan and Argentina. The forum was for the first time attended by India and Brazil, which gained a consultative status on the treaty in September 1983.

The meeting examined the question of drawing up an international convention on the mineral resources of the Antarctic and on problems of preservation and protection of the unique environment of the sixth continent and the seas washing it. Work to establish an international-legal regime of the mineral resources of the Antarctic is done on the basis of the provision of the Treaty on the Antarctic of 1959, which is an important instrument for maintaining international peace and security, developing fruitful mutually beneficial cooperation between the states concerned in that area.

The document provides for the use of the Antarctic solely for peaceful aims. It is prohibited to carry out there any measures of a military character. Thus, that part of our planet, which is larger in its size than Europe, has been announced a zone of peace and peaceful exploration.

REAGAN ANNOUNCEMENT OF REELECTION BID NOTED

LD300526 Moscow TASS in English 0511 GMT 30 Jan 84

[Text] Washington January 30 TASS -- President Reagan has officially announced his intention to seek reelection to this post for the second term at the elections due to be held next November. In the address to the nation broadcast over the TV, he said that he was putting forward his candidature in order to complete the work started three years ago.

The major part of the address was taken up by his attempts to present in a more favorable light the results of his three years in office. Contrary to the commonly known facts, he asserted that in these years both home and foreign situations of the U.S. had considerably improved. R. Reagan made it clear that if he was reelected he would not introduce any changes in his present political course which is characterized by extreme aggressiveness in the international arena and criminal disregard for the interests of rank-and-file Americans at home.

It follows from the President's address that Vice-President George Bush will also seek reelection.

Kornilov Hits Campaign Slogan

LD301103 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 30 Jan 84

["What 'Work' Would Washington Like To Finish?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS -- TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

R. Reagan has officially announced his intention to seek re-election to the post of U.S. President for the second term. A slogan on which he is going to campaign was also chosen and put to use -- to finish the work that was started three years ago. So, the question arises: What is the work the present administration would like to finish?

If one is to judge by the sonorous flow of peaceful rhetoric which has been coming from Washington of late, the impression is that the "consolidation of peace" and "arms control" are the primary concerns of the administration. However, it is not accidental that observers and numerous publications, including American ones, point out a very interesting coincidence: The most zealous attempts of the "Reagan team" to pose as "peace-makers" fell on the period when preparations for the presidential elections were started in the U.S. Considering the results of polls held in the U.S. which show that, in the opinion of nearly half of Americans, Reagan's foreign policy aggravated the danger of a nuclear war, it is not surprising that the head of the incumbent administration is now actively trying to show his "peaceful" intentions. However, it is not words but deeds that matter when peoples form an opinion of the policy pursued by this or that government.

As for Washington's deeds, they speak for themselves, no matter how many high-flown words are used to present them in a more favorable light. The White House holds forth about peace and at the same time turns Western Europe into a launching pad for American first-strike weapons. Playing up its alleged striving to achieve arms control, the U.S., in hope to gain military superiority, continues to implement the unprecedented by its scope "comprehensive" strategic program for the 80's, which is to cost American taxpayers as much as 2 trillion dollars in 1985-1989.

The U.S. Administration speaks a great deal about "the need of a dialogue." Yet, it deadlocks, disrupts and blocks all the talks on the problems of curbing the arms race, be it the question of nuclear armaments in Europe, the complete banning of nuclear arms tests, the banning of chemical weapons or the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean.

Our hands are clean, and we have never been aggressors, U.S. President R. Reagan pointed out recently at the Congress in the State of the Union message. This is an obvious lie. Without quoting history and recalling that in the past 6 years alone the U.S. Administration resorted to armed actions or the threat of force against other states 38 times, it would be enough for us to cite some facts of the present-day situation Could the bandit attack on sovereign Grenada, which is actually occupied by American troops, be described as anything else but an outright aggression? As for the activities of the U.S. in the Middle East, where the Pentagon military together with Zionist invaders are practically tearing Lebanon apart, are they not aggression? Could the aims furthered by the U.S. in the "undeclared wars" against Nicaragua and Afghanistan be described in any other way but as aggressive and interventionist? The U.S. ruling circles openly announce that nearly the whole of the planet is the "sphere of American vital interests." They turned brigandage and terrorism into official policy of the United States, they seek to place in power and prop wherever it is possible the most sanguinary, most reactionary dictatorial regimes -- and at the same time assert that the U.S. foreign policy is made by clean hands.

The thing is that from whatever point of view we assess the situation, it is more than obvious: The allegedly "peace-making" tricks of Reagan and his team, brought about by the purely time-serving considerations, have nothing to do with the real foreign policy pursued by Washington, which is based today, the same as before, on the desire to make history reverse its course, to reshape the political map of the world. So, what does the administration mean by its electoral slogan -- to finish the work started three years ago? The slogan in itself cannot but evoke serious anxiety and concern of the world public, which, as we should like to repeat, judges Washington's foreign policy not by its words but by its deeds. What is expected from Washington is not high-flown rhetoric about peace, but a real turn from the policy of diktat and aggression towards the policy of peace and international cooperation. It is this turn, and not a reliance on force or rhetoric, that can make the world a safer place to live in.

'FACE-LIFT' IN REAGAN USSR POLICY 'MANEUVERING'

LD291203 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 29 Jan 84

[Text] Moscow viewpoint, contributed by Valentin Zorin:

Possibly many of you might not be able to grasp the reasons for the negative reaction in Moscow to President Reagan's speech on 16 January, a speech in which he, among other issues, touched on United States-Soviet relations. Americans might get the impression that the Soviet Union is spurning an outstretched hand, but in fact here in the USSR there will always be a positive response to goodwill, to the desire to solve on a just and equal basis the problems dividing our countries.

The point is that we here have the most serious grounds to doubt the sincerity of Washington, which all of a sudden changed its tone and began to speak of a desire for constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union. Just a short while ago President Reagan declared the Soviet Union the empire, you see, of evil. Today he suddenly professes the wish for talks with the country he just a short while ago regarded as the focus of evil and against whom he proclaimed a crusade.

What President Reagan is doing is clear-cut maneuvering and the reason for this is apparently that the White House wants to achieve quite definite goals both inside the United States and abroad. To appear in an election year in the role of an instigator of war, a politician who destroyed everything that was worked out in the realm of Soviet-American relations by several preceding administrations, is something that is apparently not profitable for Ronald Reagan, hence his attempt to alter his image and appear before the United States public in the role of a sober-minded and level-headed politician, one who is ready for a constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union.

However, everything that President Reagan has up till now began doing in the field of Soviet-United States relations is not evoking in this country particular trust, something which is needed for such a dialogue. A careful study of the text of his speech will reveal that there is nothing but purely face-lifting operations in official Washington's line regarding the Soviet Union. Indeed, President Reagan this time changed his tone and avoided rude and sharp words about the Soviet Union but that's all. For if we take the contents of the speech rather than its form it emerges that the President has in effect shown that he hasn't abandoned his old stance and continues to insist on proceeding from the notorious position of strength in issues concerning relations with the Soviet Union. Thus he urged a resumption of the United States-Soviet talks in Geneva, which were discontinued after Washington, by deploying new nuclear missiles at the Soviet doorstep, made such negotiations meaningless.

But Mr Reagan does not take any real steps that would enable the arms limitation talks to get moving out of the state of a standstill. The President could -- and, what is more, should -- state his attitude to the Soviet proposals on a nuclear freeze, determine his attitude to the Soviet pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and to make concrete proposals aimed at curbing the arms race, which has assumed such a dangerous character. But President Reagan has not made any such move.

The Soviet Union does not have to be talked into beginning a dialogue. The United States Administration has been provided with a whole complex of Soviet proposals that constitutes a realistic basis for normalizing Soviet-United States relations and to avert an arms race. These proposals remain in force till this very day but in order to begin discussing them it is not enough to make statements about goodwill. Concrete deeds are needed and first and foremost an abandoning of attempts to gain unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union.

GERASIMOV REVIEWS U.S. POSITIONS ON DIALOGUE

LD300015 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Jan 84

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Novosti political observer Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrades. The word one hears most frequently of all in international commentaries now is "dialogue" -- Moscow is in favor of dialogue, Washington says that it also favors dialogue. Official reaction in the American capital to Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to the PRAVDA questions was emphatically optimistic. The White House reported that it welcomed the fact that -- and I quote, the Soviets, too, favor a dialogue. And this a very clever little word, "too," hinting, as it were, that the Soviets were keen, but that now they, too, were in favor of dialogue. It has to be said that since the new year they have apparently replaced wrath by a gentle approach in Washington.

In his new year interview the President promised not to repeat anymore his sharp expressions against us such as the notorious "focus of evil"; and indeed, his speech of 16 January and his State of the Union message to Congress on 25 January was in some parts reminiscent of elegant oratory. And so nowadays everyone is in favor of dialogue. But what is it that is stopping it from beginning? No doubt the snag lies in different interpretations of the very meaning of this word. The Soviet Union is in favor of an honest dialogue, one that is to the point and on equal terms.

Let us look at the American attitude to these three components. And so the first component, honesty. No one in Washington remembers now that when the present administration came to power in January 1981, soon afterwards, in February, an invitation to it to take part in dialogue at all levels resounded from the authoritative platform of the 26th CPSU Congress. So there is no need to affect pleasure in the fact that the Soviets, too, are in favor of dialogue from the very beginning: It was Washington that was not ready for it: Washington then engaged in abusive rhetoric against us. Now Reagan says that he will not do so anymore.

Recently before the new year he gave the following explanation. He said that he had already said what he thinks about us, and that there is no need to repeat it. On 22 January, in a WASHINGTON POST interview, Reagan gave a further piece of explanation. He said: I did not abuse the Russians. I simply quoted what they themselves say when I spoke about lies and deceptions and similar things. Remember Lenin's well-known words about agreements being like piecrusts -- they are always broken. It has to be said that this was not the first thing that Reagan has turned to Lenin, whose works, of course, he has not read. Reagan once spoke about 10 sinister commandments and his assistants then had to thumb through all the volumes of Lenin's "Complete Works," but of course no such commandments were discovered.

But let's turn to the pie and its piecrust, as a way of illustrating the anatomy of falsification. There is an English saying -- promises are like piecrusts, they made to be broken. And Lenin recalled this saying; he recalled it in an article entitled "The Liberals and the Land Issue in Britain." He recalled it in an appraisal of promises of reforms, promises that were made by the British Liberals. The concrete context was criticism of bourgeois politicians who are generous with their promises. And if, indeed, we are again to use this saying, then of course it can be applied to the promises of Reagan the candidate to reduce the budget deficit, and to his other promises that have indeed shared the fate of the piecrust in the saying.

This episode has direct relevance to our subject of honesty. Washington must show this honesty.

Now for the second component of dialogue: It has to be to the point. But the President's words about a constructive dialogue are uttered in some kind of vacuum, without the essential addition that would lend content to this constructive epithet. Denis Healey, the former Labor Party minister, had something opposite to say here. He said that if Reagan wants Russia to meet him halfway, he has to say where he is intending to go. For Washington does not accept for discussion the topics being put forward by Moscow -- a nuclear arms freeze, the non-first use of nuclear weapons, and all the other topics.

And finally the third component: The dialogue must proceed on equal terms. Here it is useful to listen to the way Reagan explains his evolution from initial negativism to the present enthusiasm. He says that 3 years ago America was weak. He puts it like this: Our great country stood still as if it were paralyzed. It was in no mood for dialogue. Now, on the other hand, thanks to his efforts, America has taken heart, and this includes, as the President says, the fact that morale has risen sharply in the Armed Forces. His slogan now is that America has straightened itself up to its full height.

America is now ready to hold talks, to use his, Reagan's words, from a position of strength, and in a spirit of goodwill. As far as goodwill is concerned the situation is clear; when there is goodwill you do not juggle with quotations. But what about acting from a position of strength? This, too, is clear. A position of this kind undermines the very concept of dialogue.

Let's take, say, Webster's English dictionary. There it is explained that this word means discussion. We open the Russian-language dictionary and there it is explained that dialogue is talking. That is to say in both dictionaries it is understood in the definitions that the participants in the talks are equal. A position of strength is suited not to dialogue, but to diktat. But diktat will not do for the Soviet Union. It would appear that the administration is attracted not by dialogue but by the semblance of dialogue. In engaging now in an affection for dialogue, it is thinking not about talks but about getting itself reelected for another 4 years, taking into consideration the feelings of the voters. It turns out that frantic anti-Sovietism is politically disadvantageous. This might be the only useful result of 3 years' rule by Reagan. The third anniversary was marked only the other day, and on this occasion the one celebrating the anniversary spoke himself and stressed that towards the eighties American national security was severely undermined, but that now he had strengthened it. All this had happened in the past -- or rather it had not happened in the past.

Under President Eisenhower, there was lagging behind with bombers -- in reality, there was no such lagging behind. Under President Kennedy there was lagging behind in missiles -- in reality, there was no lagging behind at all. Other versions are possible and they occurred under other Presidents. Under Reagan, they started to talk about the window of vulnerability, and then, with a wave of the hand, about shortcomings under all headings. So the 40th President is the imitator of the 33d [as heard] and subsequent Presidents. Let us return to the prime sources. America honors the memory of those who have fallen in its wars. With two exceptions, these were all wars on other people's territories. The excursion through Arlington National Cemetery takes a whole hour. The guide explains that in half of all the graves lie the heroes of the wars in Korea and Vietnam -- Americans who fell in the struggle against communism.

Also buried in Arlington is a man whose life this struggle cost in peacetime -- in fact, a bust of him has been erected in a place of honor in the Pentagon building. However, the inscription on the grave reads: James Forrestal, U.S. secretary of defense. He was secretary of defense in the years 1947-1949. This is the Navy Hospital near Washington, a hospital for the privileged, for top government people, including the President. It is here that James Forrestal died. In 1947, 2 years after the end of the war, this secretary was working on the drop-shot plan, a tennis term: a blitzkrieg plan against the Soviet Union. The nation will approve this, Forrestal thought: The only thing you have to do is to thoroughly frighten the nation, frighten it with the communists who threaten America. Forrestal frightened someone to death: himself. He went mad, and ran through the streets shouting the Russians are coming! One Sunday in May, he threw himself out of a 16-floor window at the hospital. However, the poison has remained.

Forrestal, when sick, said to a friend: Bob, the Russians are already here. On 21 January 1981 the 40th President of the United States bases the program of his government on the senseless ideas of James Forrestal. He says: My duty as President is to recommend urgently an immediate increase in the military budget over the next few years. The program for rearming America is announced. Its purpose is to achieve strategic superiority. The atomic submarine "Ohio": It carries 24 nucleurmissiles. The B-1 strategic bomber: it carries 32 cruise missiles. The MX strategic missile: it has 10 warheads. The Pershing-II: they are already being deployed in Europe. Finally, the cruise missiles.

The new strategy, justifying overarming of this kind, was presented by the Pentagon in the summer of 1982: Strikes to destroy, delivered against the Soviet Union's political and military leadership, which is the concept of taking off the head. For the umpteenth time, the Pentagon also put forward the grounds for the new strategy, a brochure: "Soviet Military Power." Every one of its hundred pages shouts about Soviet military superiority in all fields. The terrified American will discover that his country is defenseless in the face of a giant that is armed to the teeth and ready to attack. The author of the scenario and the director of the production is Caspar Weinberger, secretary of defense. A little later, the Soviet Defense Ministry published its own brochure: "From Where the Threat to Peace Comes." It recalls what has been said by different U.S. defense secretaries about there being an approximate strategic balance of forces. It gives details that were omitted in the Pentagon brochure.

On each occasion, the United States was the instigator of a new twist in the arms race. On each occasion, the Soviet Union took adequate measures in response. However, the Soviet Union also proposed that we should call a halt to the arms race. In concrete terms, for example, we will not create subprojectile warheads [s kassetnymi golovnymi chastyami]. The United States responded with a refusal. Once again their head was being turned by the illusion of technological superiority. A few years later, they observed that these subprojectile warheads had made America more vulnerable, because they also had made their appearance on the other side.

The Soviet Union also proposes that the arms race should not be started in new areas, that it should not be started in space. On 1 September 1982 the new space command of the American Air Force commenced its work in the Cheyenne Mountains in Colorado, literally in the hills, inside them.

In April 1981 the reusable shuttle spacecraft was launched. And here is the latest news from the American space authorities: The United States has tested an anti-satellite missile that is carried in the air.

The President, in his State of the Union message, set the task of creating an orbital station. And it is he who signed a special space directive to the National Security Council.

But let us return to earth. Here is another line to add to the portrait of the U.S. defense secretary. During his working visit to West Germany he said that it would be must more effective if California were to be defended not from the State of Oregon, but from New Guinea.

A friend of the defense secretary lives in the suburbs of Los Angeles. (Samuel Klein) invented two types of weapons for Europe -- to start with, the neutron bomb, and, in 1982, the gamma-weapon, which irradiates an area turning everything around into a lifeless desert.

[Begin recording of (Klein) being interviewed by unidentified interviewer -- in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Interviewer] Do you think there will be war?

[Klein] Yes, no matter how terrible this may sound, I think that there will be. I think that it is built into man's nature, to wage war. There have always been wars, particularly in Europe.

[Interviewer] You mention Europe quite frequently.

[Klein] Because the Europeans have the misfortune to have frontiers with the Soviet bloc. This means that the land threat exists for Europe and not for us. Between us there is the ocean. [end recording]

Tens of thousands of kilometers away from Los Angeles, in the land of Hesse in West Germany, these is the little town of Hattenbach. It has the misfortune of being situated on the other side of the ocean. In the summer of 1981, the inhabitants of Hattenbach suddenly saw their own small town on television. They were showing extracts from a training film for the U.S. Armed Forces.

Dr. Spock treats American children and not American politicians. But his excursion into psychiatry from pediatrics makes one reflects gloomily upon the role of paranoia in politics, which might be studied more fully, beginning with the Forrestal case. Class hatred, plus the interests of the military monopolies, are leading to deliberate falsehood, and this is already poisoning the liar himself and nearly convincing him of the fact that he is opposed by evil carried out in the darkest possible schemes. And then fears of the worst hand like a thick fog over the whole of society -- remember the replies given by the Americans at the start of the program to the question as to whether the Soviet threat is a real one. This happens when there is no confidence.

How can it be strengthened? This is a difficult question. Difficult problems concerning the strengthening of confidence are on the agenda of the Stockholm Politburo noted that this conference will be able to justify expectations if all participants in it display a feeling of responsiblity and political will for businesslike talks. The world public, too, is expressing its opinion: At the extraordinary session of the World Peace Council, which has been taking place in West Berlin, a program statement was adopted for the removal of the global threat of nuclear war.

SINO-SOVIET AMITY GROUPS MEET, MARK FESTIVAL

Tikhvinskiy Speaks

OW280305 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1230 GMT 26 Jan 84

[Text] Dear Chinese listeners: A meeting of the Central Council of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society was held at the House of Friendship With Foreign Countries on 25 January. A station reporter who took part in the meeting reports:

The meeting was presided over by Tikhvinskiy, first deputy chairman of the Central Council. It heard a report on the work of the society in 1983. The report said: The society has done a great deal of work in reporting on the living conditions of the Chinese people to the Soviet public. In 1983 the society sponsored 23 activities to mark major events in the Chinese people's revolutionary struggle and to commemorate interntionalist Chinese party members and noted Chinese writers and artists. For example, meetings were held in 1983 to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the 7 February General Strike, the 50th founding anniversary of the China Film Association, the 85th birth anniversary of noted Chinese writer Lao She and the 30th death anniversary of noted Chinese painter Xu Beihong. A big concert with the participation of noted Soviet artists was held to celebrate the 34th founding anniversary of the People's Republic of China. These activities were participated in by representatives of the Chinese Embassy in the USSR. Meetings were held last year with various types of Chinese delegations visiting the USSR. They included delegations of Chinese gymnasts, volleyballers and film workers.

The report notes with satisfaction: The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society's Central Council restored contacts with the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association in 1983. The Soviet side indicated its willingness to further develop these contacts.

Speakers at the Central Council meeting indicated that they were determined to carry out the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government toward China aimed at normalizing relations between China and the USSR. The Central Council meeting approved the society's work plan for 1984.

Kapitsa At Festival Event

OW272345 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society gave a reception in Moscow on 27 January to mark the Chinese Spring Festival.

Kapitsa, deputy minister of foreign affairs; Bernov, deputy chairman of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries; Academician Tikhvinskiy, first deputy chairman of the Central Council of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society; staff members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and activists of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society attended the reception.

Staff members of the Chinese Embassy, headed by Yang Shouzheng, ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the Soviet Union, attended the reception.

PRC ENVOY PRESENTED CHINESE-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY

PM281712 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed untitled report]

[Text] A meeting took place 27 January at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Oriental Studies Institute with the PRC's envoy to the USSR, Yang Shouzheng, who was presented with the just-published first two volumes of the "Greater Chinese-Russian Dictionary."

Kapitsa at Ceremony

OW281133 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1000 GMT 28 Jan 84

[Text] A book-presenting ceremony was held in Moscow on 27 January at the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. At the ceremony two already-published volumes of a Chinese-Russian dictionary were presented to Yang Shouzheng, Chinese ambassador to the USSR. The dictionary was compiled by the Oriental Studies Institute.

Academician Primakov, director of the institute, said in his speech that the new dictionary will be a tool for overcoming language barriers. He expressed the firm belief that the publication of dictionaries will help strengthen friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples.

Ambassador Yang Shouzheng also spoke at the ceremony. He thanked the Soviet comrades and wished for further development of Sino-Soviet cultural contacts.

Also present at the book-presenting ceremoy were Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Tikhvinskiy, an academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

APPROACHES TO PEACE, 'FATE OF DETENTE' VIEWED

AU270820 Sofia NOVO VREME in Bulgarian No 1, (Signed to Press 2 Dec 83) pp 71-83

[Article by Soviet Professor Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy, doctor of historical sciences "head of a chair at the Institute for Social Sciences": "Philosophy of Peace: From Theory to Practice", specially written for NOVO VREME -- passages in uppercase published in boldface]

[Text] The philosophy of peace is a new theroetical-political phenomenon which determines the approach of the socialist countries, of the communist, and workers' parties to the problems of international relations. It is a new concept of the goals pursued by worldwide policy and of the paths leading toward the struggle for peaceful coexistence within the great variety of contemporary human societies.

Two Approaches to War and Peace

The philosophy of war is as old as war itself. Throughout the entire history of mankind there has hardly ever been a generation that has not been confronted with war. Let us remember Herodotus of Halicarnassus: He collected the experiences of Greeks and barbarians who waged war against each other into nine volumes. He considered war not only as a very ancient practice, but as a natural state of human existence.

What about the philosophy of peace? For many centuries the rudiments of this philosophy were either restricted to idylic dreams far removed from real life, such as those conceived by Plato and Kant, or to certain principles of mutual relations between states during the short periods of recess between two wars, such as described by Hugo Grotius. "If you are longing for peace, then prepare for war" -- no one has ever been able to express this principle of alleged peace philosophy, which was the other side of military conquests and international diktat, better than the Romans -- those past masters of political formulations. Clausewitz -- the classical author of militarism -- whose name is still repeated with admiration by numerous people in the West, launched the following idea: War is the continuation of politics by other means -- and no more than this. He did not waste a single word on the victims, the devastation, and the hardships suffered by the people. This formulation reflects bourgeois morals in an unmistakable form, unmarred by demagogy.

As we know, Lenin made use of the Clausewitz formulation, but he flung it as an accusation into the face of the old, declining society of oppression and war. Lenin saw one of the chief and great advantages of socialism precisely in the fact that it aimed at salvation from wars, in the fact that it represented peace and relations among peoples based on moral principles.

It is socialism and its ideology -- Marxism-Leninism -- precisely, that introduced a drastic change in the approach to the questions of peace and war. Not only do we conduct a practical policy of peace among the peoples, but we are shaping, developing, and propagating the philosophy of peace, which is increasingly prevailing in the minds of people throughout the globe. Our basic principle is: If you are longing for peace, then you must struggle for peace, because only a constant struggle against militarism, only the unity of all peace-loving peoples, states, and movements is capable of achieving a turning point in the path of mankind away from nuclear disaster.

What is the basis of our peace philosophy, the basis of the communist's conviction that peace on earth can be preserved?

First, our philosophy is based on the glorious and noble goals and values of the workers class. It is based on the banner of communism, which bears forever the inscription of two joint words: Labor and Peace. Second, our philosophy is based on a sober analysis of the current balance of forces on the international scene, on the approximate military parity that exists today. This makes the task of averting world war not only desirable, but feasible. Our philosophy is furthermore based on the understanding of the nature of thermonuclear war and its disastrous consequences for all mankind. It is based on the unity of the will and actions of the broadest and most diversified peace-loving movements. Last, but not least, it is based on the conviction that we do not need war in order to achieve the victory of socialism on a world scale. The communist movement has rejected once and for all the alien ideology of the old and newly hatched leaders of the Hung Weibing [Red Guards of the PRC Cultural Revolution] and of the "Red Brigades," according to whom world war is a means of achieving worldwide revolution. We are confident and aware of the fact that the victory of socialism is inevitable and that it is a logical result of the worldwide historical development, a result of the class struggle within the framework of every capitalist society.

Dialectics of Peaceful Coexistence

For the first time in our era, mankind is genuinely joined together by a common destiny. Close mutual links among peoples from distant continents have emerged and are rapidly strengthening. The peoples rely and depend upon each other. The world of socialism and the world of capitalism, as well as the world of the developing countries, exist together on one planet and no one can say: stop the world, I want to get off. Scientists and politicians are engaged in numerous discussions about the concept of PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE. In all its interpretations, it presumes at least the EXISTENCE of mankind as a mimunum and its comprehensive progress and development as a maximum.

The revolution in science and technology, as well as in military affairs, and the social revolutions are introducing such changes in the peoples' consciousness and at the same time are causing such problems as can be only resolved by the joint efforts of the entire community of nations, regardless of the social systems under which they exist. These problems have been called global or universal human problems.

We could also say something more: The dialectics of worldwide development in our era has produced a new historical contradiction -- the contradiction of our entire contemporary civilization. This contradiction consists in the fact that scientific-technical revolution has to a certain extent considerably outstripped the social revolutions. The scientific-technical revolution found the world divided into two systems, and while one system -- socialism -- is organically merging with the trends toward peace and progress, the other system -- capitalism -- is a source of regression and wars. This produces negative, and in certain cases, even dramatic results, since human society as a whole has proved unprepared for a sensible, just, and purely humanitarian application of the achievements of scientific-technical revolution, of production and information.

THE DIALECTICS OF WAR AND PEACE IN OUR ERA CONSISTS IN THE FACT THAT IMPERIALISM ALONE IS NO LONGER CAPABLE OF SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF WAR, WHILE SOCIALISM ALONE IS NOT YET ABLE TO SETTLE THE PROBLEM OF PEACE. UNFORTUNATELY, THE SOLUTION OF THE MAIN UNIVERSALLY HUMAN PROBLEM -- THE PREVENTION OF A WORLDWIDE THERMONUCLEAR WAR -- DOES NOT DEPEND SOLELY UPON US, NAMELY UPON THE SYSTEM OF SOCIALISM AND UPON ALL PEACE-LOVING FORCES. WE CANNOT, HOWEVER, POSTPONE THE SOLUTION OF THIS PROBLEM TO A TIME WHEN SOCIALISM IS VICTORIOUS IN THE WORLD. IT MUST BE SOLVED UNDER THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF STRUGGLE AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD SYSTEMS, TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THE EXISTING BALANCE OF FORCES AS A FACTOR OF PEACE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE.

A number of important theoretical-political questions are emerging in this context. The first and chief question is: In which direction is the whole system of international relations developing, how is the balance of world forces changing, and what can we do for an even more effective struggle against the danger of thermonuclear war?

The 26th CPSU Congress has set a splendid example of a dialectic analysis of the entire, complicated and further complicating system of international relations. The main trend of development of this system is determined, above all, by the struggle of two social worlds -- the socialist and the capitalist one. The countries that have liberated themselves from colonial dependency are playing an increasingly independent and sometimes even contradictory role in this respect. Our contemporary world is a scene of sharp, economic, social, political and ideological contradictions. Never before has the confrontation of the sociopolitical giants, equipped with the most up to date weapons of mass destruction, been as tremendous and as menacing as today.

The struggle of exact opposites, the extremely drastic contradictions existing on the international arena are the main and most striking peculiar feature in the life of contemporary human society.

Nevertheless, it is necessary not only to see the nature of these contradictory principles, but also the nature of the common features uniting mankind. We must analyze the opportunities for cooperation between different forces by taking into consideration their aspirations, which are to a great extent contradictory. The social contradictions on the world scene by no means exclude political agreements and compromises. In this connection we should recall the anti-Hitler coalition which joined together countries with opposite systems. The successes of detente in the seventies also serve as an example in this respect. Despite the ups and downs in international relations, cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and communications sphere are following an unmistakable trend toward expansion and intensification. The economic interest, the very nature of economic competition, as well as the striving to demonstrate superiority in social relations are factors that stimulate economic, scientific-technical, cultural, and political relations.

The 26th CPSU Congress pointed out the complicated, dialectic processes that are occuring within the framework of the capitalist system as regards international relations as well. We are talking about the growing contradictions between the leading centers of economic power in the capitalist countries, namely between the United States, Western Europe, and Japan. Despite the fact that these contradictions are of secondary importance compared with the basic contradiction of our era -- the contradiction between capitalism and socialism -- the peace-loving forces nevertheless have the opportunity to take advantage of these contradictions, and in particular of the objective interest demonstrated by the West European countries to preserve detente and to develop their cooperation with the socialist countries.

The increasing role of the newly liberated countries on the world scene is complicated and sometimes even controversial. We have not accepted the term "Third World" since the newly liberated countries, as a rule, have joined one of the two basic world systems. However, there is no doubt that these countries are pursuing their own specific goals and interests. This specific character is reflected in the struggle for a new economic order, for the settlement of the "North-South" problem, as well as in the nonalignement policy to which nearly the majority of the developing countries belongs. As for the further development of these states, we must point out the dangerous trend of establishing new centers of economic and military power in their regions, including the possibility that some of them already possess nuclear weapons, or are about to produce them in the near future.

In the changing pattern of contradictory trends on the international scene, there is a force in active participation with which mankind is capable of solving the entire chain of global problems -- above all, the problem of universal peace. This force is represented by world socialism. Socialism is the basic guarantor of peace and progress on our globe. Its successes, its initiative, and its active peace policy determine to a decisive extent the possibility of averting nuclear war, the possibility of solving all other problems which are confronting mankind in a century full of stormy events.

The Crisis in U.S. Geopolitical Theories and the Fate of Detente

Today's developments in the world are determined by the struggle between two trends in international politics. On the one hand, there is the trend toward taming the arms race, strengthening peace and detente, and defending the peoples' sovereign rights and freedoms. On the other hand, there is the trend toward undermining detente, toward escalating the arms race; there is the policy of threats and interference in other countries' domestic affairs, the policy of suppressing the liberation struggle. This is where we find the key to understanding the historical period of development that began at the end of the 1970's and is the beginning of the 1980's -- a period of intense struggle between the forces for detente and against detente.

There is no doubt in our opinion that the U.S. ruling circles are chiefly responsible for undermining detente, for the drastic aggravation of international tension. However, how can we explain the drastic change from detente to anti-detente within the United States itself?

This is a complicated question, but there is no doubt that the reasons for this change must be sought not only in subjective factors or, to put it more precisely, in the fact that the neoconservatives are now ruling in the White House, or to put it even more precisely, in the ascent of the overt reactionaries, headed by Ronald Reagan. Their very ascent has even more profound reasons. We think that these reasons should be sought in the crisis of American geopolitics which are intertwined with the domestic economic crisis in an intricate knot. Reagan and his team are not trying to unite this knot, but simply to cut it with the one-track methods of the hawks.

The main reason for the geopolitical crisis in the United States is the decline in their military and political power in the world throughout the period of the 1970's. The United States is unwilling to resign itself to such a course of events on the one hand; and on the other hand, the ruling circles within the country are incapable of adapting themselves to the new situation.

The geopolitical crisis in the United States is linked primarily to the basic contradiction of our epoch -- the contradiction between socialism and communism. The White House reacted dramatically to the balance of military power between the United States and the USSR which had been established at a certain stage of development, considering this fact to be a tragedy. Thus, the White House was unable to learn the necessary lessons from this fact, the main lesson being the following: Attempts to achieve military superiority over the other side are vain in our day; any attempt to "pulling ahead" in the arms race increases the military danger threatening the world without increasing the security of either side. This serves only to open a new round in the arms race. The other side, confronted with the necessity of reacting to a new threat, as a rule proves capable of restoring the balance of forces within a short period of time. As a matter of fact, this even increases the level of confrontation.

Along with this, the exacerbation of contradictions within the capitalist system itself becomes no less important. The decline in the relative share of U.S. power within the framework of the Western alliances which sensitively manifested itself during the 1970's caused considerable irritation and concern in the United States. (As early as 1979 the nine Common Market member-countries had outstripped the United States in gross national product, while Japan was already considerably ahead of the United States in this respect).

Of course, the United States is infinitely superior to its allies as regards military strength. Nevertheless, the U.S. leadership is being increasingly questioned within the framework of the Western alliances. Last, but not least, there is another reason for the American power crisis connected with the exacerbation of contradictions between imperialism and the newly-liberated countries. The United States' ability to exert pressure on those liberated countries whose energy supplies are very important to the United States has been drastically restricted. (It is sufficient to point out that the United States is importing nearly 40 percent of its oil from the aforementioned countries). The great and prolonged increase in oil and oil product prices (these prices, as a matter of fact, increased 16 times during the period 1973-82), in addition to the fact that the United States has lost Iran, heavily affected the most sensitive sector of the U.S. economy and drove the American strategists almost to a state of hysteria.

The geopolitical crisis -- in addition to economic decline, inflation, and the increase in the unemployment rate in the United States -- utterly dismayed the U.S. ruling circles. The conclusion they drew from this situation was completely erroneous as well. They tried to increase their military power in order to enhance their political influence in the world.

The drastic increase of military budgets, the escalation of large-scale military programs, the establishment of new military commands, the intensification of the arms race on land, in the sea, and in the air, the plans to extend the arms race to space, and the attempt to concoct a global military coalition against the socialist community member-countries -- some sort of "super-NATO", if we may use this appropriate idiomatic expression -- all this is accompanied by an unconstructive, obstructionist policy in all negotiations directly or indirectly pertaining to the banning of the arms race. This is the policy pursued by the United States throughout the first half of the 1980's. Today the minimum objective of the United States is to impose on the Soviet Union an "arms race which is beyond the capacity of the USSR". The goal of the United States, providing that this policy is successfully implemented, is to achieve a "victory without war" which, in turn, will serve as a base for further conducting its well-known and traditional, imperialist policy "from a position of strength" on a qualitatively new basis. In addition to this, the United States is obviously striving to score several goals with one stroke. Namely, not only to intensify its pressure upon the socialist countries, but also to strengthen its leadership within the Western alliances as well as to intimidate and subject the developing countries to its influence, in particular those countries whose energy supplies are of decisive importance to the United States. However, is it not quite clear that these methods will not disrupt the balance of military forces between the USSR and the United States, will not change the balance of economic forces between the United States and its allies, and will not solve the energy problem? Even the authors of the "muscles policy" in Washington are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that their plans belong to the realm of utopia. This is why they are evidently becoming very nervous, going from one extreme to the other, and have recently tried all sorts of manipulations in order to lessen their contradictions with official West European circles and to confuse the antiwar movements, which have expanded on an unprecedently large scale throughout the world.

The American leaders' efforts to blame all their problems and difficulties in the international sphere on the Soviet Union seem stupid and naive in view of the real facts. There is even more: The very fact that the feverish maneuvers of the United States in its relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are being confronted with a calm, moderate, and unmistakable Soviet program aimed at improving bilateral relations and at alleviating international tension offers the United States the historical change of earnestly and responsibly evaluating the situation, taking into consideration its own true interests and those of the other states.

What Do We Understand By the Concept "Universal Peace"?

The second important theoretical-political problem pertains to the coordination of the class approach with the general humanitarian approach as regards the questions of war and peace. Our class philosophy of peace is also a philosophy of social progress. The peoples are, above all, asking for a secure, reliable, and irrevocable peace. However, they are also asking themselves what kind of peace this will be -- whether it will be just and democratic, or unjust and oppressive. The social status quo is impossible to maintain, because it is impossible to stop human progress -- either by command or by agreement.

This is where one of the real contradictions of contemporary life lies. Universal peace does not mean "universal appeasement". In excluding wars among states as a means for achieving the goals of social reorganization, universal peace preserves a platform for class struggle in an antagonistic society, a platform for social and national liberation. In openly stating this fact we, the representatives of real socialism, are stressing the following: Our peace philosophy is a philosophy of universally human goals as well. In this thermonuclear and electronic century, the problem of preserving universal peace and of averting a disastrous conflict ranks as the primary concern on everybody's list of international priorities. The worldwide policy as an independent phenomenon is a policy with one global goal: to avert thermonuclear war, which is a disaster that would affect all of mankind.

For a better understanding of the correlation between the class approach and the general humanitarian approach, we must specify the concept of "peace." One can talk about peace among states, about peace among nations, about peace among social groups and individuals, and so forth. As a result of this, the concept of "peace" can be referred (along with concepts such as "policy" and "power", as well as certain others) to the category of polysemantic concepts. In talking about global problems, however, such as averting thermonuclear war, we are talking about the category of universal peace -- which we consider to be a general human asset -- as an absolute value. This is in contrast to the relative values which are significant for individual states, nations, and social groups, and which therefore have a more narrow focus.

Hence, it becomes obvious that not all forms of peace are of an absolute or relative value. Whenever we talk about peace between the dominating and oppressed nations, between the ruling and the oppressed classes, between oppressor states and independent states, it is appropriate to distinguish between JUST AND UNJUST peace. For the preservation of such peace has a value which the oppressed classes and nations are justified in rejecting. The renouncement of or the abstention from social violence is not always a benefit, and consequently not every kind of peace is a goal of national policy.

As for the popular slogan of the Western reactionaries **"better dead than Red"** we by no means reply "better dead than white," because we are convinced that such a dilemma does not exist. As people used to say in the old days -- render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God, the things that are God's.

Universal peace is a universal principle of interstate relations. The class struggle is a universal principle of relations between oppressors and oppressed. There is no doubt that nothing is more important than universal peace. In addition, however, peace is a value that marches hand in hand with social progress.

The Arms Race: General and Specific Concepts

Another important problem of peace philosophy is affecting the dialectic of the arms race. In this case -- there are two opposed class stands as well -- the socialist and the imperialist.

Imperialism sees the outcome for itself in mass destruction, in the attempts to obtain military superiority over socialism. Socialism, however, sees its path and the path of all mankind in curbing the arms race, in gradual disarmament, in the destruction of arms and in total banning of nuclear, and other weapons of mass destruction.

What is the reason for the particular danger represented by the arms race at the contemporary stage of development? In answering the questions of the periodical DER SPIEGEL in April 1983, Yuriy Andropov pointed out as follows in this connection: "The complexity and danger of the present situation lies in the fact that the arms race forced upon us by the West is forestalling the negotiations."

It is precisely from this point of view that we must consider the permanently growing military expenditures, the level and quality of existing weapons. The process of the arms race is assuming such proportions today as are forcing authoritative state and political leaders, as well as famous scientists, and public figures to warn about the possibility that this process may get out of control.

The true source of the arms race is well known. The United States, precisely, began to increase its military expenditures, to expand a series of military programs on a long-term basis reaching far into the 21st century. The United States, precisely, is now stubbornly striving for weapons aimed at a first strike, and on the basis of such weapons, it is preparing military doctrines and working out strategic plans. Even the preservation of the present rates of speed in the arms race is likely to lead the world to a doubling of its military expenditures in the coming 15-20 years -- and, as a minimum objective, to double the number of nuclear warheads, the use of which is likely to cause irreparable damage to our planet: even without using any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction -- the presently existing ones and those likely to be produced in the course of the persistent arms race -- may cause such damage.

A particular danger in this respect is represented by "giving the green light" to the deployment of hundreds of new American intermediate-range missiles in Europe. The attitude of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community member-countries to this dangerous step of the United States and of the other NATO members is well known. In their efforts to avert the appearance of the "nuclear gun set at Europe's temple", the USSR has done everything in its power to implement the negotiations on intermediate-range missiles and tactical weapons alike -- the USSR, at the Geneva negotiations, declared its readiness to agree on the parity of nuclear potentials in Europe, both as regards missile carriers and as regards warheads, taking into consideration the existing, respective weapons in Britain and France, of course.

People within NATO remained deaf to this proposal; they disregarded the warning that the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe represents an attempt to disrupt the existing balance of forces in Europe and on a worldwide scale. This means that the danger of war is increasingly nearing the threshold of our continent. This attitude forces the Soviet Union to express a specific warning that such a new menace against the security of the USSR and its allies will lead to the adoption of timely and effective countermeasures, including those aimed at the territory of the United States itself.

A resolute warning of this kind was made in the Soviet Government declaration issued on 28 May 1983 and in Comrade Yuriy Andropov's speech delivered on 6 June. In both cases, it was stressed that the dangerous aggravation of the situation should be stopped before it is too late. "We would not want things to go this far," the secretary general of the CPSU Central Committee stated. "We are in favor of a Europe, free of the nuclear threat. As in the past, we are ready today basically to agree on the greatest reductions of nuclear arsenals in Europe, on both sides. However, this requires an honest agreement based on equal rights."

A broad, positive response of worldwide public opinion was evoked by the declaration issued by Yuriy Andropov, CPSU Central Committee secretary general and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, on 24 November 1983, in which the Soviet Union confirmed its basic adherence to the policy of stopping the arms race, above all, in the nuclear sector. Along with this, the declaration explains with correct arguments, why the Soviet Union considers it impossible to continue to participate in the Geneva negotiations on the reduction of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. In view of the deployment of the new American "Euromissiles," these negotiations would become a cover for U.S. actions and for the activities of their NATO allies aimed at undermining European and international security. Should the United States and the other NATO states return to the situation existing before the deployment of "Euromissiles" in Britain, the FRG, and Italy, the Soviet Union would adopt such a step, as well. Then the numerous proposals submitted by it on the restriction and reduction of nuclear armaments in Europe would become valid once again. In the opposite case, the United States and the countries that applied the so-called NATO "two-track" decision have to bear the entire responsibility for their shortsighted trend toward military superiority and for having violated the approximate strategic parity in Europe. The aforementioned declaration once more stressed that the USSR and all Warsaw Pact states will not permit the balance of nuclear potentials in Europe to be disrupted and affect their security.

The Washington plans to transfer the burden of military confrontation to Europe, by averting the danger for itself, from the very beginning evoked the concern of millions of people on the European Continent. Today this concern has assumed the features of a clearly expressed antiwar, antimissile, and antinuclear policy, as well, in recognition of the Soviet side's being "equally responsible" for the detente critis. Such an approach by no means facilitates the expansion of the peace forces, nor does it contribute to an increase of their contribution to the consolidation of international security.

The social, economic, and political consequences of the arms race for the developing countries represent an undisputed source of concern. Half of the total arms exports today are destined for the developing countries. (Generally speaking, throughout the 1970's their share in arms imports amounted to 75 percent). The concentration of arms imports to certain countries and areas led to the establishment of new regional centers of military and economic power. In addition to this, the process of the armaments race produces numerous and very negative results precisely for the developing countries. Such negative results can be described as follows: an increasing deterioration of economic development prospects; inevitable physical restrictions, particularly in the energy sector and in the case of certain irreplaceable raw material resources; as well as an increasing polarization of wealth and poverty in such areas; and unsatisfactory rates of development in these countries. The arms race and the ever growing discrepancy in prosperity levels bewween the developed and the developing countries are becoming sources of instability throughout the world.

Security in the Nuclear Arms Century: Where Can We Find It?

In justifying its policy of confrontation with the USSR and its negative approach to detente, the U.S. Administration headed by Reagan refers to the interests of its own country's security and to the security of the West as a whole. The question of correlation between nuclear arms and national security, the question of the dialectics of thermonuclear war deserves particular attention in this respect.

As you know, an obdurate cliche exists in the United States -- and not only at the White House, but often even in the consciousness of the people's masses -- namely that great nuclear power guarantees greater security for the nation. This is an utterly erroneous concept. No one can deny that at the time of the historic decision to develop nuclear weapons in 1945 the United States' security was fully guaranteed. Had the United States abjured the production of nuclear weapons at that time and had it signed an agreement with the Soviet Union and other countries on this question, then there would be more security today.

Twenty years had elapsed, throughout which the arms race was expanding, and in 1965 the American military experts came to the conclusion that no less than 60-80 million Americans would perish as a result of an "exchange of nuclear strikes." Fifteen more years passed and this figure increased to 120-130 million people. It is not necessary to be a prophet in order to forecast that within 10-15 more years the thermonuclear danger will threaten the entire population of the United States, as well as other nations and countries. What this means, however, is not security for the United States and for all mankind. In other words -- it means a danger of total annihilation. The work on the establishment of a "total antimissile defense system," which is one of the American President's favorite ideas and conversation topics, will by no means introduce any changes in this respect. Neither this system, nor any other defense system is likely to guarantee 100-percent security for the United States -- this is the conclusion of the majority of scientists. A new escalation in the production of strategic weapons, however, as well as a qualitatively new stage in the militarization of space -- these will be the inevitable results of that system -- with all the consequences that entails for the whole world, including the United States.

At a certain stage of the confrontation between East and West, a quite normal and absolutely natural reverse took place in connection with the nuclear bomb and national security: a greater number of bombs began to signify not more, but less security for the United States, the USSR, and all other countries and peoples, for all mankind, in general.

Nuclear security -- this is an absolutely meaningless concept. None of the two sides is able to guarantee its peoples' security with the help of the nuclear bomb, nor can it ensure the safety of its towns and villages, of its industrial achievements, and cultural assets. A change in the nuclear power development of one side actually stimulates changes in the nuclear power development of the other. Since this power is by all means a destructive one -- a power of total devastation, as a matter of fact -- any change in this power automatically increases the danger for both sides and for the population throughout the globe.

This is the dialectic of thermonuclear arms, which however, is not easily accessible to a mediocre mind and those with a traditional mentality. The U.S. ruling circles are facing increasing difficulties in trying to justify their growing military ambitions by referring to the interests of security. In the course of events, the American public is becoming increasingly convinced of the fact that the selfish interests of the military-political elite, which are opposed to the true national interests, are concealed behind this smokescreen.

What Will a Future World Look Like?

Two opposed class stands also exist on the questions of the further development of our current system of international relations. This system is based on the balance of forces.

One of them -- the bourgeois approach -- is based on a further ramification of the bloc system and its expansion to all countries in the world. This is the so-called "pluralistic" system in which the bourgeois side sees some kind of advantage over the so-called "bipolar" system.

Some American scholars (such as Kahn and Wiener, for example) assume the possibility of establishing blocs such as North American, European, Latin American, African, Arab, Indian, Chinese, and other ones. Their imagination goes so far as to picture some sort of administrative forms and ruling organs within the framework of these international blocs, as well as the existence of discipline and rules for settling international conflicts.

Such "images of the future" unmistakably reveal the shortcomings and faults of the system of international relations based on a persistent arms race. Logically projected into the future the current international system actually supports the trend toward the establishment of regional military-political alliances and blocs. However, the intensification of such trends in the future is likely to escalate the thermonuclear arms race and the race in other types of weapons within the framework of blocs and alliances that would be sufficiently autonomous in their actions. The emergence of such pluralistic systems is likely to intensify the effect of the factors working to the encouragement of worldwide thermonuclear conflicts, the opportunity to legalize traditional wars with the trend toward an escalation to thermonuclear conlficts. This is likely to greatly increase the influence of totalitarian regimes, or of irrational and accidental factors in politics, and likely to erect insurmountable obstacles to averting the arms race.

How can we describe the constructive alternative to the system of the balance of forces, an alternative capable of contributing to the preservation of universal peace? This alternative is represented by a PLANNED, UNIVERSAL PEACE, namely by a state under which all states, or the majority of them, are implementing purpose-oriented actions aimed at the consolidation of international peace and at the prevention of a thermonuclear world war, at a gradual disarmament, as well as at the total banning of the production and use of nuclear arms. In other words -- such actions are likely to produce a true peaceful coexistence. The emergence of such an international situation must be preceded by the transition from a PASSIVE universal peace to an ACTIVE universal peace, which should further develop into a PLANNED PEACE. This, precisely, is the basis of the Peace Program adopted and developed by the 24th, 25th, and 26th CPSU Congresses.

We have an ideal model in mind in this respect, of course. Its actual implementation will require a prolonged historical period.

The state of planned peace is based on the realistic prognosis that the ideological and political struggle between the two basic world systems will continue. This state means only that the actions leading to a worldwide thermonuclear war will be excluded, legally banned, and made practically impossible. Such actions apply to thermonuclear arms, in the first place, but will also include other mass destruction weapons in the long run, as well as aggressive, regional wars, and so forth.

The inevitable ideological-political struggle on the international scene and the economic competition between the two opposed systems must not be transformed into a state of military-political, international conflicts, must not be settled by war among peoples.

The main link in implementing the universal peace program is the effort to stop the arms race, gradually to proceed toward disarmament in the sector of thermonuclear war, and -- as a final objective -- to aim at the full reunification of the production and use of thermonuclear weapons. Experience has already demonstrated to a sufficient extent that the implementation of this program is an extremely complicated task involving great responsibility. Nevertheless, mankind has no other choice.

ROMANIAN REACTION TO ANDROPOV INTERVIEW CITED

PM271605 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 84 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Following the Unvarying Course of Peace"]

[Excerpts] Despite the increased danger of war, the Soviet Union is consistently adhering to its unvarying course aimed at safeguarding peace, preventing the arms race, and developing peaceful cooperation between states. That is the leitmotif of the extensive international responses to Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's replies to PRAVDA's questions. The USSR, the foreign press is emphasizing, has been and remains a convinced champion of the solution of urgent international probelms at the conference table and of honest dialogue on an equal basis aimed at achieving specific accords.

Yu. V. Andropov, the Romanian newspaper SCINTEIA notes, stressed that the main reasons for the increase in the dangerous tension in the world and in Europe have not been removed, that Soviet-U.S. dialogue must be conducted on an equal basis and should be aimed at achieving specific accords. The Soviet leader noted that the Soviet Union is prepared to resolve the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe only on a constructive, mutually acceptable basis. Before it is too late the United States and NATO must display the readiness to return to the situation which existed before the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles.

U.S. 'EASING' OF POLISH SANCTIONS SCOFFED

LD281517 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1500 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Excerpts] Aleksandr Danilov comments on the Washington report on the easing of some so-called sanctions against Poland. Official U.S. propaganda described these measures as goodwill gestures, as a step aimed at improving relations with Poland. But it is known that they consist only of permission for the Polish fishing fleet to return to traditional fishing grounds near the U.S. coast and for a restricted number of charter flights for the Polish LOT Airline. That is all. In other words, the White House has decided to ease only certain sanctions, out of which one proved to be ineffective because Polish fishermen have managed on other fishing grounds, and the other one is rather of a symbolic nature.

Thus, the United States certainly does not intend to restore normal relations with Poland. Washington still does not want to observe commitments resulting from trade and economic agreements concluded with Poland earlier. Washington has illegally and unilaterally abrogated these agreements, calling them sanctions. Poland has suffered great losses, and still does, as a result of this measure joined later under U.S. pressure by some Western countries. Polish experts have assessed the annual losses as approximately one-half of Poland's indebtedness to Western creditors.

Nevertheless, the organizers of the offensive aimed against Poland's economic positions have not achieved their basic objective. In fact, the Polish problem is not being settled according to Washington's scenarios. The calculations that under a powerful financial and economic pressure, Poland will beg for mercy have failed. It is well known that in order to make it possible for Poland to extricate itself from the complex economic situation, a number of urgent measures have been adopted.

The Soviet Union and other CEMA members have in good time assisted the Polish Peoples Republic. Presumably taking all this into consideration, the tactics in Washington have been altered several times. While preserving the overall shape of basic sanctions, the White House is now renouncing those least effective. Nevertheless, this gesture is being exploited to foment anti-Polish sentiments, to exercise pressure on the leadership of the Polish Peoples Republic.

In other words, Washington continues to make the same political demands. The objective is to revitalize the antisocialist forces, to grant complete freedom of action to the counterrevolution. Furthermore, the announcement of partial easing of the two least-effective restrictions against Poland had another objective.

Poland, as many times before, was useful for Reagan in his political game with the West Europeans. It was needed when the President wanted to appear to his allies as an intransigent crusader, a determined fighter against world communism. Now, in turn, it was necessary to calm down the intimidated and disappointed allies who are worried by the U.S. leader's aggressive attitude.

Through the easing of restrictions aimed against Poland -- let us add that this easing has been applied to very insignificant sanctions -- Washington tries to achieve the same objectives that existed at the time of their introduction. The objective is the exploitation of Polish problems in the interest of U.S. imperialism.

REGULAR SESSION OF POLISH SEJM REPORTED

LD271109 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] Warsaw January 27 TASS -- A regular session of the Polish Sejm has been held here. It was attended by Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP), chairman of Poland's Council of Ministers, and by other leaders of the republic.

The deputies discussed draft statutes on elections to the People's Councils and on extending the term of the Sejm's powers. It was emphasized that the major goal of the forthcoming elections is to implement the principles of socialist democracy, and to enhance the responsibility of People's Councils for the accomplishment of tasks set. The Sejm endorsed a number of draft laws, including a law on the press.

TASS, PAP SIGN NEW COOPERATION AGREEMENT

LD281434 Moscow TASS in English 1155 GMT 28 Jan 84

[Text] Warsaw January 28 TASS -- A new agreement on cooperation between the News Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS) and the Polish Press Agency PAP was signed here today. The document was signed by Sergey Losev, TASS director general, and Janusz Roszkowski, president-chief editor of PAP. Aleksandr Aksyonov, the ambassador of the USSR to the Polish People's Republic, was present at the signing ceremony.

During the visit Sergey Losev met with Jan Glowczyk, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP), secretary of the PUWP Central Committee, Mieczyslaw Rakowski, deputy chairman of Poland's Council of Ministers, Helenka Majka, head of the Information Department of the PUWP Central Committee, and Wieslaw Bek, editor-in-chief of the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU. The TASS director general also visited the Krakow Voivodship where he had a conversation with Josef Gajewiecz, first secretary of the Krakow Committee of the PUWP.

U.S. MIDDLE EAST POLICY, ROLE ANALYZED

LD271022 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] Moscow January 27 TASS -- The newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, analyzing the USA's Middle East policy, writes: "The USA has moved on from every kind of assistance to the Israeli aggressor to direct participation in armed actions on Lebanese soil by committing land, naval and air forces to action. Having secured a military staging area there under the signboard of 'mulitnational forces' and having brought a naval armada to the Lebanese coast and having shut its eyes and ears not to see and hear the world public opinion and the moaning of its own victims, the USA methodically, cold-bloodedly and by direct laying [as received] fires at Lebanon".

The strategic cooperation between the USA and Israel, formalised by a special memorandum in November 1981, became in the summer of the next year the driving belt of the invasion of Lebanon a 100,000-strong Israeli Army, the invasion during which thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians were killed by bombs, shells and bullets with the 'made in the USA' marking, the newspaper goes on. The Israeli killers were rewarded for the genocide they staged in Lebanon by the elevation of the U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation to a new level during the visit by Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir of Israel to the USA in November 1983. It was also promised to Tel Aviv that the U.S. entire military aid for this year would be for the first time granted free of charge.

The turn in Washington's Middle East policy from attempts at playing the role of 'peace-maker' and honest mediator' between Israel and the Arabs to an overt collusion with the aggressor, collusion which has not been camouflaged with those fig-leaves, and to direct participation together with Israel in the war against the Arabs has become another and natural stage, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA states.

"The irrefutable facts of the development of events in the Middle East in the past several years", the newspaper stresses, "are an evidence more than ever before that the USA's 'new role' in the region is already directed not against any individual Arab country or political force but against all the Arabs without exception -- both progressive, 'moderate' and 'conservative'.

"In the present complex political situation in the Middle East", SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes in conclusion, "the task of rallying all the sound national-patriotic forces of the Arab world for a rebuff to the U.S.-Israeli collusion is acquiring paramount importance. Of no lesser importance is to keep political vigilance against the U.S. revived attempts at imposing the capitulatory projects for a Middle East 'settlement' upon the Arabs to the thunder of cannonade and the howling of bombers, the projects which the Arabs have been rejecting."

CONGRESS PRESSURED ON LEBANON TROOP WITHDRAWAL

'Catastrophic Consequences'

LD271613 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] Washington January 27 TASS -- The Reagan administration has launched a massive campaign of pressure on the Congress in an attempt to prevent the latter from taking a decision on withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon.

The campaign has been started by the U.S. President personally. Over the past few days he had two meetings with Congress leaders. Then U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz addressed a closed Senate Foreign Relations Committee meeting and closed meetings of both chmbers of the Congress. As member of the House of Representatives Rober Matsui said, the President had been trying to frighten the legislators with "catastrophic consequences", in which the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon may allegedly result. In his words, the USA could lose in such a case the whole of the Middle East. In his turn, Deputy Assistant to the President Robert McFarlane claimed in the newspaper WASHINGTON TIMES that the withdrawal of the U.S. Marines from Lebanon would inflict serious damage upon the United States interests.

The massive campaign for brainwashing the legislators has so far failed to produce the desired results. Two draft resolutions have been tabled at the House of Representatives of the Congress calling for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon. Simultaneously work to draw up another two bills demanding immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from that county is nearing completion in Senate on the initiative of Senators Joseph Biden and Claiborne Pell.

The group of Democrat Senators has condemned the policy of the U.S. Administration in Lebanon. After an emergency meeting of the group, Robert Byrd, the democratic minority leader in the upper chamber of the congress, stressed that the Democrats intend to do their utmost to make the White House change its present-day baneful policy and withdraw U.S. Marines from Lebanon. Discontent with the President's policy is also mounting among the ranks of his own party. Lee Hamilton, member of the House of Representatives, said at a meeting with Richard Murphy, U.S. assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern and South Asian affairs, that the Congress was losing patience. The stand of the Congressmen is expalined in a large measure by the general sentiments among the Americans, who ever more persistently demand that the Marines be withdrawn from that country. As the latest public opinion poll carried out by the NBC television company has shown, 58 per cent of the Americans favour immediate withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon.

Anti-War Demonstrations

LD292139 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Jan 84

[From the Vremya newscast; A. Druzhinin report from Washington]

[Text] In Washington political circles no secret in being made of the fact that the Reagan administration intends to exert strong pressure on Congress in order to force it to agree to the U.S. troops staying on in Lebanon, that is, to the effective dismemberment of the country and its subjugation to U.S. military dictates.

With no less zeal, the administration will be defending its course of aggression in Central America and seeking increased support for repressive regimes in that region and approval for subversive action aimed against the independent people of Nicaragua. It is expected that the White House will employ every means to push the draft military budget for the 1985 financial year through Congress: $226 billion is the sum planned for the needs of the American military and dangerous military preparations throughout the world, including production of the latest nuclear weapons systems such as the MX missile and the Pershings and cruise missiles that the Pentagon is already deploying in West Europe.

But the Washington legislators will not find it easy to ignore the alarm, dissatisfaction and protests provoked by U.S. foreign policy among many Americans. These sentiments are shown in incessant antiwar demonstrations by Americans. The pictures you see were taken outside the Congress building at the time when Reagan was delivering his State of the Union message there, justifying and lauding his foreign policy as a policy of peace. [shots of demonstrators outside congress building] But the participants in the antiwar demonstration were of a different opinion. They were demanding an end to U.S. aggression in the Near East and Central America and an end to the nuclear arms race. And this demonstration was just one example of the fact that there are no few people in America who reject the dangerous foreign policy course of the Reagan administration.

U.S. ACTIONS IN LEBANON DUBBED 'REAGAN'S VIETNAM'

LD292101 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 29 Jan 84

[Nikolay Andreyev commentary]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan's State of the Union message included the following passage: We pray to God to protect our troops who are guarding our tranquility in Lebanon.

It becomes clear from these words that it is not the Lebanese whose land is groaning at pain and bitterness and who need protection, but the Amercian troops who brought death, bloodshed, and destruction who need protection. It is noticed that the current White House incumbent has special terminology whose meaning cannot be grasped except after careful study. This is because he describes aid to dictatorial regimes in Latin America as a defense of freedom and democracy and the seizure of defenseless Grenada as a preventive measure. He describes the bombing of Lebanese towns and villages as bolstering peace.

However, inventing expressions of this sort is not a new fashion for the imperialists, including the U.S. imperialists. Suffice it to mention, for example, the dirty war that the Yankees fought in Vietnam, bearing in mind that it is compared more and more with the current U.S. adventure in Lebanon. A number of Arab newspapers recently printed commentaries entitled: The Middle East Is Reagan's Vietnam. True, there is a great similiarity. We also find the same figure of speech in describing the aggression and the same (?approach) by way of escalating the armed intervention. Despite this, specific disparities do exist, and although they are tactical in character, they are nevertheless disparities.

In Vietnam, the United States basically acted on its own, but now it is trying to make the responsibility for the acts of piracy in the Middle East shared by its allies in NATO and the hireling regimes subservient to it. Washington is undoubtedly playing the major role in Lebanon. For it is not by chance that one-third of the U.S. airmen in the U.S. Air Force who have been taking part in the Lebanese adventure actually went through the Vietnamese school. It is significant, however, that Lebanon like Vietnam in the past has become a proving ground for testing American weapons, and it is noted that most types of these weapons are banned; among them we find cluster bombs, fragmentation bombs, and phospherus bombs. We also see a similiarity in the methods of gradual buildup of forces. Today 30 of the 40 vessels of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean are to be found in Lebanese waters. As for the 300 warplanes and 30,000 landing troops, they are ready to joint at a moment's notice the Marines who have been engaged in warlike activities on the shore.

On 4 December 1983, the U.S. military resorted to the direct use of the Vietnamese experience. Twenty-eight bombers took off from the aircraft carriers "Independence" and "John Kennedy" to raid the positions of the Syrian formations in the Al-Biqa' Valley; these forces have been there since 1976 under a decision by the Arab League. Their presence prevents the Americans from expending the dimensions of their intervention and turning Lebanon into a real field of aggression against the Arab states in the Middle East.

The adventure failed its planners, for not all the planes that took part in the piratical air raid returned to base. These were the first losses of U.S. planes since the Vietnamese war. And Washington began to worry whether it might be conceivable that they would bring back memories of the dirty Vietnamese adventure that cost the United States about 60,000 of its citizens and resulted in the destruction of the Pentagon forces. Even so, it was decided to bring the warship "New Jersey," which belongs to the super class, into the Lebanese adventure, bearing in mind that its crews have a very rich experience in the annihilation of the Vietnamese towns and villages. Today it bombs Lebanese towns and villages with its high caliber guns.

At the time, the U.S. newspapers wrote with insolence: We are sending to Vietnam the cream of our young men to practice their best hobby, namely killing Viets, a derisory name which the Americans had given to the Vietnamese. Today it is a hobby of these chosen young men killing the Lebanese. Is not this the basis of calling the current U.S. invasion of Lebanon Reagan's Lebanese Vietnam?

SYRIA'S AL-ASAD DENOUNCES U.S. AGGRESSION

LD291421 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 29 Jan 84

[Text] Damascus January 29 TASS -- Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad has vigorously denounced U.S. acts of aggression and plans directed against Arab countries. Speaking on national television, he charged that American imperialists and their Israeli allies were seeking to establish their domination in Arab lands and to thwart the national liberation struggle by Arab nations. But those imperialist designs were doomed. The Arabs were fighting for their freedom and independence, Hafiz al-Asad emphasized. He said the Syrian people were today were ready to defend their homeland and would uphold its national interests with unfailing courage and determination, repulsing all enemies who would try to encroach upon their freedom and destiny.

FRG'S KOHL'S VISIT TO ISRAEL 'MOST COMPLICATED'

LD251859 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 23 Jan 84

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program, by Nikolay Grechkov]

[Text] Helmut Kohl, chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, is on a 5-day official visit to Israel. He will hold talks with Israeli Prime Minister Shamir, address the Knesset, and meet the mayor of occupied Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek. On Tuesday, Prime Minister Shamir held a banquet in honor of the West German guest at which he expressed satisfaction with the development of the economic and scientific relations between Israel and West Germany. Chancellor Kohl declared his government's adherence to the 1980 EEC Declaration on the Middle East, which contains, as is known, an ambiguous reference to the national rights of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

The German chancellor did not utter a word on Tel Aviv's violation of the rights of the Arabs in Lebanon and in the occupied Arab territories.

Commenting on the visit of the West German chancellor to Israel, the French paper LIBERATION said it appears that it will be the most complicated foreign visit made by Kohl. Why? Observers attribute the reason to the fact that his government does not wish to complicate relations with the Arab world, where Bonn has vast economic and political interests; and at the same time the CDU-CSU government wants, by consolidating its relations with Zionist Israel, to please its senior partner in NATO, the United States, with which Bonn expresses solidarity in its policy in nearly all fields.

TUDEH MEMBER TRAILS, PERSECUTION VIEWED

GF291500 Baku International Service in Persian 1400 GMT 28 Jan 84

[Unattributed commentary]

[Summary from poor reception] Dear listeners, according to reports received from Tehran, conviction orders for 86 Tudeh Party members have been issued. These people have been sentenced to serve various terms ranging from 6 months to life imprisionment. Further Tudeh trials are also expected in Shiraz, Tabriz,and Kerman.

The Tudeh Party organ MARDOM, published outside Iran, recalling the 28th Mordad events that had been engineered by the American CIA, wrote that our comrades were being tried in military courts. Before the trail they had been tortured to obtain evidence against them.

The sole crime of the Tudehis has been opposition to the shah's oppression. The Tudeh Party desires a better future for the workers of Iran and has been using all its resources to achieve this.

It is a pity that on the even of the fifth anniversary of the revolution, in which the Iranian communists actively participated, these communists are in prisions and are being tried in military courts. Once again, as in the past, they are being accused of spying, and once again they are being tortured for the required information. Various kinds of physical torture are being used against them and drugs are also being used so that their brains are affected and they say that the state officials want them to say. However, despite all these efforts little has been gleaned from them.

Is there any doubt that if the courts had any proof against the Tudeh members, they would have disclosed them to the public? If those who are trying the Tudeh members had any proof, they would have published it in the press. However, since there was no such proof, they did not do so.

Communists in any country are staunch members of their party and are never guided by external hands. They have direct contact with the people, they act as representatives of the masses, and they defend what is right. The conservative elements in Iran want to defeat the revolutionary elements. However, the revolutionary ideas and slogans remain a part of the Tudeh Party. The conservative elements not only want to destroy the Tudeh Party, they want to destroy its ideals as well. However, this is not possible. The shah engaged in a similar task for nearly one-third of a century and not only did he fail in that task, he also met his political doom in the bargain.

The deals and aspirations that the Tudeh Party members fight for have a value in the hearts of the workers.

The statement of the Central Committee of the Feda'iyan-e Khalq Organization, which was reported by RAH-E TUDEH -- a daily published in the Persian language in the Federal Republic of Germany -- cited the sham trial of a number of Iranian military officers accused of being Tudeh Party members and said that the authors of this buffoonery aim at discrediting the party of the working classes of Iran and creating doubts about the friendly policies of the Soviet Union toward Iran. The Central Committee of the Feda'iyan-e Khalq Organization of Iran calls on the world people to defend the patriots in Iran.

FRANCE PREPARING OFFENSIVE OPERATIONS IN CHAD

LD292128 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 29 Jan 84

[Text] Paris January 29 TASS -- According to reports from Ndjamena, the French interventionist troops in Chad have taken up new positions as a result of capture by them of the line along the 16th parallel between the towns of Koro Toro and Oum Chalouba. Army helicopters are intensively carrying out reconnaissance flights. As news agencies point out, from now on the French invasion force is on the forward line of combat operations and is ready for a new offensive in the north of Chad, where the troops of the Transitional National Unity Government are stationed.

Military observers believe, the REUTERS agency points out in its telegram from Paris, that the French are preparing offensive operations against the Transitional National Unity Government in an attempt to change the balance of forces in Habre's favour.

Paris continues building up the strike power of its Air Force in Chad, by sending there war planes from bases in the south of France and in Gabon.

In his statement, representative of the Transitional National Unity Government in Paris, Abderahman Moussa, warned the French Government about dangerous consequences of stepped up military interference in France in the affairs of Chad. By its actions, he stressed, Paris is kindling the conflict in Chad. The Transitional Government is sufficiently strong to counterattack the enemy at any time, counter the U.S. and French imperialism and its local placemen, A. Moussa said. France and the pro-Western Ndjamena regime, he stressed, aim at an actual partitioning of Chad and preventing any peaceful settlement in the country.

Tripoli January 29 TASS -- The Libyan JANA news agency has strongly condemned the escalation of French military interference in Chad. The forces of imperialism, the agency stresses, are again kindling the flames of civil war in that country. The French Government should wake up to the fact that the internal events in Chad concern only the Chadian people.

Lagos January 29 TASS -- Nigeria is concerned over the sharp aggravation of military tensions in Chad, said Foreign Minister Ibrahim Gambari. He pointed out that his government had taken diplomatic steps for an urgent discussion of the situation in Chad at the Organization of African Unity. To us, the Nigerian minister stressed, the main concern is to ensure peace in Africa.

U.S. AID, INVESTMENT IN SOMALIA CRITICIZED

EA281525 Moscow in Somali to East Africa 1600 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] As reported by Radio Mogadishu in the past week, Somali President Mohamed Said Barre had talks with an American delegation led by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester Crocker.

After hearing the radio reports, informed sources in Nairobi say there is nothing new in the stand of the Somali leader. He reiterated his readiness to transfer the natural riches of Somalia to American firms. He reaffirmed that the Somali economy is open to foreign investment.

All this shows that the Somali leadership continues to solicit aid from the superpower with which it has signed a military pact. The question is whether the Americans will give Somalia the funds it needs to boost its economy.

Informed sources point out that Muhammad Siad Barre persists with the same excuse for seeking American aid. Earlier, he complained of unprovoked aggression by Ethiopia against Somalia, and repeated that it is imperative to defend the interests of his regime.

The Somali leader's tactics are threadbare, and he is well aware that America will not contribute to ensuring permanent peace in the Horn of Africa. Both the Mogadishu regime and Washington have the same interest in continued tension and instability in the Horn of Africa.

CPSU 'OPEN LETTER' TO ELECTION COMMISSIONS

LD271642 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Open letter to constituency electoral commissions on USSR Supreme Soviet elections]

[Text] Dear comrades: We, members of the CPSU Central Committee, have received from collectives of enterprises, organizations, establishments, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, educational establishments and military units, as well as the participants of constituency pre-election conferences, letters and telegrams in which they report on the nomination of each of us as candidates for deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation to a number of electoral constituencies, and request that we give our assent to stand for these constituencies.

We express profound gratitude and heartfelt thanks to the labor collectives, workers, kolkhoz farmers, engineering and technical personnel, office workers, those engaged in science and culture, Army and Navy servicemen, Communists and non-party workers, and all the electorate who have nominated us as candidates for deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

We ascribe this high honor and the great trust placed in us entirely to the Leninist Communist Party which puts the interests of the people and concern for maintaining and strengthening peace above all else.

We consider the trust and unanimity of the electorate as testimony to the monolithic unity [splochennost] of our society and the full support of the Soviet people for the party's domestic and foreign policy, and their determination to strengthen by selfless labor the homeland's economic and defense might, and to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the November 1982 Pelnum and subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and to successfully fulfill the plans for 1984 and the 5-year-plan as a whole.

Since each of us, according to the law on elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, can only stand in one constituency, the CPSU Central Committee has recommended that we agree to stand in the following constituencies:

Andropov, Yuriy Vladimirovich -- Soviet of the Union, Proletarskiy constituency, Moscow.

Aliyev, Geydar Aliyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Baku Leninskiy constituency, Baku.

Vorotnikov, Vitaliy Ivanovich -- Soviet of the Union, Rossoshanskiy constituency, Voronezh Oblast.

Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Ipatovskiy constituency, Stavropol Kray.

Grishin, Viktor Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Perovskiy constituency, Moscow.

Gromyko, Andrey Andreyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Minsk-Moskovskiy constituency, Minsk.

Kunayev, Dinmukhamed Akhmedovich -- Soviet of the Union, Alma-Ata-Leninskiy constituency, Alma-Ata.

Romanov, Grigory Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Leningrad City constituency, RSFSR.
Solomentsev, Mikhail Sergeyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Shakhtinskiy constituency, Rostov Oblast
Tikhonov, Nikolay Aleksandrovich -- Soviet of the Nationalities, Moscow City constiuency, RSFSR.
Ustinov, Dmitriy Fedorovich -- Soviet of the Union, Kuntsevskiy constituency, Moscow.
Chernenko, Konstantin Ustinovich -- Soviet of the Union, Kuybyshevskiy constituency, Moscow.
Shcherbitskiy, Vladimir Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Leninskiy constituency, Kiev.
Demichev, Petr Nilovich -- Soviet of the Union, Lyuberetskiy constituency, Moscow Oblast.
Dolgikh, Vladimir Ivanovich -- Soviet of the Union, Leninskiy constituency, Krasnoyarsk Kray.
Kuznetsov, Vasiliy Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Volgograd constituency, RSFSR.
Ponomarev, Boris Nikolayevich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Kalinin constituency, RSFSR.
Chebrikov, Viktor Mikhaylovich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Sukhumi-Leninskiy constituency, Abkhaz ASSR.
Shevardnadze, Eduard Amzrosyevich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Tbilisi-Leninskiy constituency, Georgian SSR.
Zimyanin, Mikhail Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Krasnodar constituency, RSFSR.
Kapitonov, Ivan Vasiliyevich -- Soviet of the Union, Kineshemskiy constituency, Ivanovo Oblast.
Ligachev, Yegor Kuzmich -- Soviet of the Union, Tomskiy constitutency, Tomsk Oblast.
Rusakov, Konstantin Viktorovich -- Soviet of Nationalities, Leninakan central constituency, Armenian SSR.
Ryzhkov, Nikolay Ivanovich -- Soviet of the Union, Chkalovskiy contituency, Sverdlovsk Oblast.

We request the appropriate constituency electoral commissions on the elections for the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation to consider this letter as a document on the registration of the deputy-candidates.

The letter was signed by Comrades Andropov, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gorbachev, Grishin, Gromyko, Kunayev, Romanov, Solomentsev, Tikhonov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Ligachev, Rusakov, and Ryzhkov.

ANDROPOV REGISTERS FOR SUPREME SOVIET ELECTIONS

PM281630 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 29 Jan 84 pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Worthy Representatives of the People. The Registration of Candidate Deputies for the USSR Supreme Soviet Has Begun"]

[Excerpt] The election campaign under way throughout the country in an atmosphere of nationwide political and labor enthusiasm has entered a new important stage. On 28 January the okrug electoral commissions began the registration of candidate deputies to the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The first candidate deputies to the country's supreme organ of state power -- the worthy sons and daughters of the motherland -- have been registered in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Alma-Ata, Baku, and other cities.

The working people of the capital's Proletarskiy and Zhdanovskiy Rayons, which are part of Moscow City's Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug for the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, learned with immense satisfaction in the open letter to the electoral commissions published in the press that Yu.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has consented to run for USSR Supreme Soviet deputy for this electoral Okrug. The collectives of the plants, construction sites, institutions, organizations, and educational establishments situated in this okrug are grateful to Yuriy Vladimirovich for this. They fully support the domestic and foreign policies of the Communist Party and the purposeful, fruitful activity of its Leninist Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

A session of Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug's electoral commission has taken place in a ceremonial atmosphere. The session was opened by the commission's chairman, Hero of Socialist Labor V.S. Pavlovskiy, a fitter at Moscow's I.A. Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant.

Yesterday, he said, we learned that Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has consented to run for USSR Supreme Soviet deputy for the capital's Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug.

The session participants greeted these words with ardent, prolonged applause.

In preparing for the elections, the commission chairman went on, Soviet people are rallying still more closely around the CPSU Central Committee, around its Politburo headed by that outstanding figure of our party and state Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, whom the people have designated their first candidate deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

All Soviet people know Yuriy Vladimirovich as an unwavering and committed fighter for Lenin's great cause and for the triumph of communist ideas, a person who devotes all his strength, knowledge, and experience to the implementation of the party's decisions.

In Comrade Yu.V. Andropov the Communists, all the working people, and our foreign friends see an outstanding leader of the Leninist type.

Yuriy Vladimirovich's consent to run for USSR Supreme Soviet deputy for the Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug is perceived by us as a great honor and a sign of great trust. The okrug's working people, responding with deeds to the decisions of the December (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, are fully resolved to mount still more widely socialist competition for the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the annual targets and for the raising of labor productivity and the reduction of output prime costs in excess of the planned targets.

They are declaring their aspiration to work more efficiently and to strengthen discipline organization, and order everywhere.

Then the floor was given to V.A. Sedova, a core maker in the Likhachev plant's steel and nonferrous metal casting shop. On behalf of the enterprise collective she introduced a proposal to register Comrade Yu.V. Andropov as candidate deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug. This proposal was ardently supported by L.F. Baranova, chairman of the trade union committee of the Moscow Meat Industry Production Association; A.F. Yegorova, polisher at the First State Ball Bearing Plant; V.F. Krivosheyev, director of the scientific research institute of the schools of the RSFSR Education Ministry, and by A.F. Korchagin, first secretary of Proletarskiy Raykom.

A resolution to register Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, as candidate deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug for the elections to the Soviet of the Union was adopted unanimously.

SUPREME SOVIET ELECTION PROPAGANDA VIEWED

PM271153, [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 January 1984 Second Edition publishes on page 2 a 1,500-word unattributed article entitled "Important Event in the Country's Life; How to Conduct Political Studies Devoted To the USSR Supreme Soviet Elections." The article states: "It is recommended to conduct two 2-hour lessons (or one 3-hour lesson) with soldiers, sailors, sergeants, and warrant officers on the subject 'the USSR Supreme Soviet elections are an important event in the country's political life.' The purpose of the lessons is to help enhance servicemen's political awareness and their activeness in service, military labor, and the sociopolitical life of collectives." The following questions are to be examined during the lessons: 1 -- The USSR's political system. The CPSU is the nucleus of the political system of Soviet society; 2 -- The USSR Supreme Soviet is the supreme organ of state power. Candidate deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet are the people's worthy representatives; 3 -- The genuine democratism of the Soviet electoral system; 4 -- Soviet servicemen and citizens of the USSR enjoying full rights." The article is followed by an approved reading list.

LEADERS ATTEND MOSCOW PARTY CONFERENCE

LD272122 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Jan 84

[Text] The 25th Moscow City report-back and election party conference opened today in the hall of columns of the House of the Unions. It will review the activity of the Moscow City party organization in the reviewed period and will discuss tasks arising from the resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum held in December, and from the provisions and conclusions contained in the speech by Comrade Andropov.

In the presidium, met by prolonged applause, were comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Grishin, Gromyko, Solomentsev, Tikhonov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Demichev, Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Chebrikov, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Ligachev, Rusakov, and Ryzhkov.

Delegates elected with the enthusiasm the honorary Presidium comprising members of CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Viktor Vasiliyevich Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom presented the Moscow Gorkom review report.

Resolutions of the 26th party congress and plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee held in November 1982, and June and December 1983, he said, have become a mighty stimulus for raising the political and labor activity of the masses. They have resulted in great successes in all spheres of life of Soviet society. The Leninist course of the party and the versatile, fruitful activity of the Central Committee and the Politburo of the Central Committee, headed by Comrade Andropov, are ardently approved and supported by Communists and all working people. The Moscow City party organization, by its entire activity, has confirmed that it has been and still is a reliable support of the CPSU Central Committee in the implementation of plans of communist construction.

The main result of work done in the reviewed period is that comprehensive and dynamic development of the economy has been ensured; state plans for the first 3 years of the 5-year plan have been fulfilled; the volume of industrial production in this period has increased by hundreds of millions of rubles. Increased productivity accounts for the entire increase in the volume of production that has been achieved. Much has been done to improve people's welfare. Housing conditions have been improved for 900,000 people. The directions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum held in December have been reflected broadly in socialist pledges of working people of the capital for 1984. It is contemplated to fulfill ahead of schedule annual tasks in all sectors; to produce R300 million worth of production over the plan; to construct 100,000 square meters of housing over the plan. It is planned to achieve a 1 percent increase of labor productivity over the plan and to reduce the production cost by an extra 1/2 percent. This is the central point of adopted pledges.

The speaker paid a lot of attention to ideological work perfection tasks. The elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet are to become, the speaker stressed, an event of a great political importance in the work of the city party organization, and a genuine review of activities of soviets of people's deputies. For this reason, meetings of candidate deputies with electors should be of a businesslike nature and remarks by the electorate should be examined speedily. Much work is ahead of us, Comrade Grishin said in conclusion. The capital's party organization sees its main tasks in tireless implementation of the political course of the party. It will continue to be a combat detachment of the CPSU, loyal to the great Lenin's banner.

Comrade Stepanov, chairman of the Auditing Commission of the city party organization presented a report, which was followed by a debate.

GRISHIN ELECTED FIRST SECRETARY IN MOSCOW GORKOM

LD282136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 28 Jan 84

[Text] The 25th Moscow City party conference resumed work today in the hall of the columns of the House of the Unions. With prolonged applause the delegates greeted Comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Grishin, Solomentsev, Ustinov, Cherenenko, Demichev, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Chebrikov, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Ligachev and Ryzhkov. The delegates continued discussion of the report of the city party organization. It was noted that one of the main tasks facing the capital's Communists is the strengthening of the leading branches of Moscow's economy, its industry, transportation, capital construction and city administration. The speedy transformation of the economy along the path of intensive development is to play a decisive role in achieving this goal.

The conference elected the leading bodies of the city party organization. With this, it ended its work.

A plenum of the Moscow Gorkom elected at the conference took place today. Organizational matters were considered. Comrade Grishin was elected first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom.

PARTY CONGRESS 17TH ANNIVERSARY REVIEWED

PM291610 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 84 First Edition p 2

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Kolesnikov: "On the Path of Creation; on the 50th Anniversary of the 17th All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress"]

[Text] Socialist civilization has a history spanning several decades. And the more fully and vividly the new society develops in all the wealth of its features and colors, the more important the creative quest and exploit of its first builders seem. Nowadays the concept of "socialism" cannot be revealed without real experience of history.

"This experience shows how complex are many of the problems arising on the path of socialist creation," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov has noted. "But it also attests that only socialism can resolve the most complex questions of social existence."

Great significance for determining the paths and nature of socialism's development in our country attached to the 17th All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(B)] Congress, which opened in Moscow 26 January 1934. It marked the end of a transitional period -- the giant leap from former backwardness to the pinnacles of industry, technology, and culture; from small-peasant fragmentation to a collective, large-scale, mechanized agriculture. To this day we are impressed by the labor reports compressed into newspaper headlines: new production sectors created..., thousands of enterprises constructed and commissioned..., great new cities arise....

This boost was no simple quantitative buildup of strength. Qualitative advances had taken place in the economy and in social relations. An unbroken socialist tenor was established in the national economy.

Such rapid changes prompted ideas of a miracle. But it could only seem that way to an onlooker. The party Central Committee report clearly defined the source of this "miracle." The achievements of the land of the soviets were based on loyalty to the course outlined by Lenin, on the development of socialist competition, on the collective labor of tens of millions of people, on the basis of the advantages of the socialist economic system. This was the first time that these advantages had been displayed so boldly to the whole world. For the first time a new society showed its ability not only to estimate accurately the progress of its own building but also to outstrip time by rapidly implementing the boldest plan projects. The First 5-Year Plan was carried out in 4 years. The 17th VDP(B) Congress approved the Second 5-Year Plan targets. The definitive liquidation of capitalist elements, the total destruction of the causes of man's exploitation of man, and the consolidation and development of socialist production relations were set as its main political task. It was very important to strengthen the country's defense -- the cancerous growth of fascism was spreading in Europe; the conflagration of world war was imminent, with the forces of imperialism acting as its kindlers.

The socialist economy increasingly acquired the features of an integral system. And that meant that it was essential to develop corresponding methods of managing the national economy. They emerged in the course of persistent creative quest. A difficult quest. On this path we had to overcome attempts to "repeal" the objective laws of economic development and commodity-money relations. It was also necessary to counter "market" concepts into which their authors intended to squeeze the rapidly growing socialist economy.

The speeches delivered by the delegates to the 17th VKP(B) Congress and the party directives on the Second 5-Year Plan laid down methods of economic leadership, used a precise political analysis to verify methods of planning, and outlined the priority, the paramount tasks.

The party revealed the strategic avenues and key problems of the functioning of the socialist economy as a single whole. That is why to this day, at a qualitatively new level of its development, from the height of 50 years' experience of social creation, many of them retain their importance.

The congress called the completion of technical modernization the main economic task of the 5-year plan. The main condition for its implementation was the assimilation of new equipment and production facilities and the best use of what was already built and created.

As the 16th party congress noted, the priority, the constant requirement for the socialist economy's development is the systematic growth of labor productivity and the reduction of prime cost -- problems which are topical to this day. The consolidation of conscious discipline -- what at the congress G.K. Orgzhonikidze called the inculcation of respect for one's output, for one's labor -- has also remained an important task.

Socialism is characterized by the fact that its economic plans are targeted on improving the working people's well-being. It was essentially the 17th congress' decisions that most graphically revealed this social orientation. On the basis of labor productivity growth it was planned to considerably increase real wages, to improve (as far as was possible at the time) Soviet people's material and cultural living standards and to improve the quality of goods. "Fighting for good textiles, good footwear, a good suit of clothing, good butter," V.V. Kuybyshev said at the congress, "is now no less honorable a task than taking part in the construction of heavy industry projects like the State Dnepr Construction Project." The party set the task of developing consumer goods production in all sectors of industry and making maximum use of local initiative for the purpose.

The organically inherent feature that is its realism and its consideration of existing potential is graphically manifested in the elaboration of the party's economic policy. This applied, for instance, to the 17th VKP (B) Congress' solution to the question of industrial growth rates. Initial plans were specified for the main plan indicators. They were brought into line with the national economy's real potential.

The new society's future largely depends on how fully the main principle of socialism -- from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor -- is implemented. In those years, when the socialist system of economic management was still only being set up, opinions were current with reference to socialism as "universal equality" in distribution and consumption. This equality was sometimes understood here as leveling down, evening out people's requirements, tastes, and daily routine. The 17th congress sharply refuted these views. The party confirmed the Marxist-Leninist proposition that genuine socialism presupposes not the reduction of personal requirements but their sensible expansion, their flowering and comprehensive and full satisfaction. The working man and his interests, needs, and requirements have become the aim and point of tremendous constructive work.

It was precisely the working person's energy, initiative, and enthusiasm which defined the rhythm and pathos of socialist building. For millions of construction workers of the new world, labor for the common wealth became a matter of honor, glory, valor, and heroism.

At the same time the consolidation of the new, socialist tenor of life and the assertion of a socialist, collectivist awareness could not, of course, be a once-only act. The process of turning "mine" into "ours" takes a long time and develops on many levels. This process was particularly complex in the countryside.

The 17th VKP (B) Congress noted the successes in carrying out collectivization and set the task of consolidating the kolkhozcs organizationally and economically. But as well as these problems the congress delegates also considered the reshaping of the peasants' mentality and ways of developing a collectivist consciousness and conduct in every Soviet citizen. This gigantic operation, initiated by October, acquired particular importance with the building of the foundation of socialism.

The destiny of the new society is linked most directly and immediately with the methods by which the Communist Party's leading role is implemented and how effectively this is done. The fact that by the time of its 17th congress the unity and cohesion of the VKP (B) had strengthened was an enormous gain. The prolonged internal party struggle ended with the total defeat of the anti-Leninist factions, of those who did not believe in the possibility of building socialism in our country.

The dimensions, complexity, and novelty of the tasks facing the party gave rise to the need to improve the standard of organizational and practical leadership and exactingness toward cadres and all Communists. In particular, it was a matter of getting rid of workers who, having performed some service in the past, believed that they could avoid implementing party and state decisions.

The delegates also repeatedly referred to "leaders" of the kind who were constantly "mobilizing," "putting the question point-blank," "achieving a breakthrough" while in fact making no progress. These people were aptly called "honest windbags" from the congress rostrum. The enhancement of cadres' responsibility, high exactingness toward them for irreproachable performance of their duties, efficiency and initiative, the unconditional fulfillment of the tasks facing them -- that is how our party still defines today the key to success in creative work.

Guided by Marxist-Leninist science, the Communist Party has developed the teaching on socialism and embodied it in practice, blazing trails previously unknown to anyone. Many difficulties had to be surmounted on this road. The implementation of much of what was planned 50 years ago proved more complex than was thought at the time. Ideas about the nature of socialist civilization have been clarified and specific times taken to achieve particular goals determined more accurately. But at all stages of history our advance has been guided and continues to be guided by the collective reason of Lenin's party, now resolving the imposing tasks of improving developed socialism.

FULFILLMENT OF DEPUTIES' MANDATES NOTED

PM251559 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jan 84 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed article under the rubric "Our Consultations": "Voters' Instructions"]

[Text] At the election meetings voters are giving their deputies instructions. "The relevant soviets of people's deputies," Article 102 of the USSR Constitution states, "examine voters' instructions, consider them in drafting plans for economic and social development and compiling the budget, organize the fulfillment of instructions, and inform citizens of their implementation."

Work with voters' instructions, the establishment of a unified procedure for submitting instructions at election meetings, their subsequent examination, and the organization of their fulfillment are governed by the 1 September 1980 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On Organizing Work With Voters' Instructions." All the union and autonomous republics have drafted and approved republican statutes on organizing work with voters' instructions.

One of the main features of legislation on instructions is the precise and clear definition of which of the voters' proposals may be regarded as mandates. It has been established that instructions are proposals of public importance made by the voters and approved by election meetings. On the basis of the results of the discussion of proposals the decision is taken to approve them or reject them and this decision is included in the minutes of the election meeting. The minutes usually indicate the time and place of the meeting, the number present, the surname, name, and patronymic of the candidate deputy, the number of electoral okrug, the content of the instruction proposal, and the number of votes for or against each proposal. An extract from the minutes of the election meeting is sent to the gorispolkom, city rayispolkom, or settlement or rural soviet ispolkom on whose territory the meeting was held.

The legislation governing instructions contains provisions enshrining the prevailing practice of the participation in the work of election meetings of representatives of the executive committees of soviets and public organizations which when necessary can provide the relevant explanations for the proposals submitted, provide information on previously adopted plans and the prospects of economic and social development, or express a qualified opinion on the possibility of fulfilling a particular proposal. Practice shows that where the discussion of proposals on instructions is organized with a consideration for the demands put forward, as a rule there are no unrealistic or infeasible instructions.

Legislative acts pay great attention to the organization of work with instructions after their approval by election meetings. It has been laid down that the consideration, generalization, and preliminary study of voters' instructions whose implementation comes within the scope of local soviets are implemented by their ispolkoms. To this end the ispolkoms form special commissions consisting of ispolkom leaders, deputies, and workers in planning and financial organs and other national economy specialists. The ispolkoms send the generalized instructions for preliminary evaluation to the relevant sections and administrations and to the enterprises, institutions, and organizations which within a set period supply a substantiated evaluation with an indication of the likely volume of work, sources of finance, and deadlines for fulfilling each instruction. Considering the data received, the ispolkoms, with the participation of the standing commissions, draft plans of measures for fulfilling the instructions and submit them for the soviet's approval.

The plan of measures reflects the content of the instructions, the deputy to which they are assigned, measures for fulfilling the instructions, the deadlines for their fulfillment, and the state organs, enterprises, institutions, and officials ensuring the instructions' implementation. The plan of measures can include also those instructions previously adopted by the soviet for long-term execution.

Fundamental importance attaches to the demand laid down by Article 4 of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree "On Organizing Work With Voters' Instructions" to the effect that the decision to accept instructions for execution and the plan of measures for their fulfillment are adopted by the same soviet responsible for implementing existing instructions.

The instructions whose implementation is within the scope of higher-ranking state organs are sent to the executive and administrative organs of a higher-ranking soviet.

The procedure for examining voters' instructions issued to the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and coming within the jurisdiction of all-union organs is governed in a particular way. Such instructions, under Article 7 of the decree, are examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium or, on its instruction, by the USSR Council of Ministers.

Legislation has stipulated that the ministries, state committees, and departments must ensure that enterprises, institutions, and organizations submit to the appropriate soviet, indicators for the draft plan and approved plans with respect to the section concerning the fulfillment of voters' instructions. Here attention is drawn to the soviet's right to make its own proposals to the relevant higher-ranking organs on questions of fulfilling voters' instructions.

In work with voters' instructions an important place belongs to questions concerned with organizing control over their implementation. The soviets and their ispolkoms regularly hear reports from the leaders of state organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations and from officials on the progress in fulfilling instructions. These questions are annually discussed at sessions of the soviets while examining reports on the fulfillment of plans for economic and social development and the implementation of the budget and are a component of the conclusions and coreports of the soviets' standing commissions. The standing commissions and territorial and production deputies groups monitor the fulfillment of instructions, carry out checks, and hear reports and announcements from officials on these issues.

Noting the deputies' role in organizing the monitoring of the fulfillment of voters' instructions, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree has laid down (Articles 12 and 13) that the deputy has the right to appeal on these issues to all state and public organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations, and to take part in the examination of the issues he has raised. The state and public organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations and their officials must help the deputy in his work to fulfill voters' instructions.

Great importance in work with voters' instructions attaches to publicity and to informing deputies and the population of the progress in fulfilling the necessary work. The legislation on instructions devotes considerable attention to these questions.

ROLE OF DISCIPLINE IN PRODUCTIVITY DISCUSSED

PM241616 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Jan 84 p 3

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Chaplygin: "The Most Important, the Main Thing; V.I. Lenin on Labor Productivity Growth"]

[Text] Vladimir Ilich Lenin bequeathed to us a harmonious conception of the nationwide struggle to build a socialist economy. A key place in this concept belongs to the question of labor productivity growth -- the most important, the main condition for the victory of socialism and definitive transition to communism.

Labor productivity growth determines the material base of the new society. The higher it is, then the more resources it has at its disposal, the more economically powerful it is, and the broader its potential for improving the people's well-being. Under present conditions, when there is a struggle to intensify production, the importance of labor productivity has increased still further. Now every percentage point by which it is increased ensures a R5.3-billion increase in the national income, and that is a lot -- almost one-third of the annual increase. To produce revenue of that size would involve spending the labor of approximately 1 million workers.

So high a "price" for just 1 percentage point of labor productivity growth naturally requires that a special attitude be displayed toward this growth. The CPSU Central Committee December Plenum urged all national economy workers to launch socialist competition this year to surpass the plan targets for this key indicator by 1 percent. What will the country and all Soviet people obtain? If every collective raises its labor productivity by an additional 1 percent, above-plan output worth approximately R7 billion will be produced. The labor of about 400,000 people will also be saved -- almost as many workers and employees are now employed in water transport as a whole.

Every sector of industry can make a substantial contribution to this additional increase. For power workers it is equivalent to almost 15 billion kwh of above-plan electricity -- approximately the same amount is generated by all the power stations in Georgia. If oil industry workers, miners, and gas extraction workers raise their productivity by a further 1 percent the national economy will receive 20.5 million metric tons of standard fuel. That is the amount needed in a year by the three largest power stations -- the Urengoy, Zaporozhye, and Reftinskiy stations. For metallurgical industry workers a 1 percent above-plan productivity increase "weighs" over 1 million metric tons of finished rolled ferrous metal -- that, incidentally, is the amount consumed in a year by the enterprises of the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry. There is a substantial "price" on a 1 percent above-plan increase in labor productivity for the machine building workers. For instance, if the tractor builders achieve this increase they will produce about 6,000 additional tractors. Is that a lot? They could replace almost half of Armenian agriculture's tractor stock. But imagine that the construction workers have also increased their productivity by an above-plan 1 percent. The additional amount of construction and installation work would be impressive -- approximately R700 million. In housing construction that is equivalent to constructing a city of no less than 300,000 inhabitants.

As you can see, the appeal of the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum is of tremendous economic importance. Both to build up our production potential and to assure a further improvement in the people's welfare.

That is why it has met with such a broad response among the labor collectives. The Donetsk miners and textile workers, the Zhdanov metallurgical workers, and the Novokramatorsk machine builders have suggested making the additional 1 percent labor productivity growth the norm for every collective.

While paying tribute to the working people's initiative and creativity in the struggle for the highest labor productivity, we must bear in mind that the determining factor for boosting it is technical progress. "The higher the development of technology," Vladimir Ilich taught, "the more man's manual labor is ousted, replaced by a series of increasingly complex machines...." That is the essence of the influence of scientific and technical progress on labor productivity growth.

The state plan for this year includes over 1,500 targets for the assimilation and introduction of new equipment, progressive manufacturing methods, and means of mechanization and automation. About 4,000 modern types of machinery, equipment, and materials will go to newly-constructed plants and shops and replace obsolete models at existing enterprises. The introduction of new equipment in conjunction with measures for the scientific organization of labor must ensure the entire increase in output.

However, at many enterprises the technical base of production is being improved only slowly and plan targets are not always completely fulfilled. That is why the proportion of physically heavy, unskilled labor is still great. Particularly in auxiliary production facilities. Every other industrial worker works there, and only one out of four uses machinery and mechanisms. The most technically-weak sector is warehousing, transportation, and loading and unloading work. Fundamental importance is attached to mechanizing it. Perhaps the biggest and as yet least used reserve for labor productivity growth lies here. That is why of the 170 scientific and technical programs outlined for this 5-year plan 40 are directly aimed at reducing manual labor. The task has been set of releasing at least 1.2 million industrial workers from manual labor. And the greatest effect is expected from mechanizing loading and unloading, transport, and warehousing operations, the level of whose mechanization should be raised to 82-85 percent.

An enormous part in resolving this important economic and social task is played by the "Shift Manual Labor Onto the Shoulders of Machines" movement. In Latvia and in Zaporozhye, Chelyabinsk, Kuybyshev, and other oblasts the movement is being conducted according to comprehensive targeted programs. And these have already produced the first results: In the middle of the 5-year plan it was possible to halt the absolute growth in the number of people engaged in manual work, and in industry it has even dropped by 300,000.

In the struggle for the highest labor productivity V.I. Lenin attached great importance to the scientific organization of labor. "Without it," Vladimir Ilich pointed out, "it is impossible to raise productivity..." This instruction of Lenin's is being consistently implemented. In industry up to half the additional production is ensured through measures for the scientific organization of labor. Particularly good prospects are opened up by the introduction of standard layouts for workplaces [tipovyye proyekty rabochikh mest]. Each incorporates the latest achievements of science and advanced experience. Workplaces for 9 million industrial workers have already been created using these layouts. The plan for the current 5-year plan involves the introduction of such layouts for approximately another 4 million workers in the mass professions, engineering and technical workers, and employees.

One of the most effective means of seeking out and using reserves for labor productivity growth is substantiated labor norm-setting.

It has been calculated that every ruble spent on improving labor norms will save the national economy R10-12. There are many enterprises where virtually all workers are working according to technically substantiated norms. But it frequently happens that norms are revised only slowly and are set without taking technical measures into account. They are easily overfulfilled and the wages fund is overspent, but labor productivity fails to grow. Yet V.I. Lenin insistently demanded the strictest monitoring of the extent of labor and the extent of consumption and the strictest observation of the principle of "...a single norm in production and the distribution of products."

The production norm must not dampen people's ardor but discipline them and prompt them to improve their qualifications and vocational skill. It can only be intensive and justified. Here too the initiative of the workers themselves is very important. An example is the many years' experience of the Aksay Plastics Plant, where the workers voluntarily review their labor norms. This method is used at 365 enterprises in Rostov Oblast. The Shchekino method is also popular. It is employed by over 10,000 production associations and enterprises employing 18 million people. Working "Shchekino-style," over the 5-year plan these collectives have released nearly 1 million workers, who have moved to other enterprises and establishments where there was a manpower shortage.

Labor productivity is directly and immediately linked with the level of discipline. Vladimir Ilich urged people "...to work without respite on the creation of discipline and self-discipline, on the strengthening of organization, order, and efficiency everywhere and in everything..." We need a crusade for the strengthening of discipline, he said, because raising discipline is a condition of labor productivity growth and "is the linchpin of all economic building..."

Consider Lenin's words: "The linchpin of all economic building..." Accurate words which reveal better than anything the importance of strong labor discipline in our day. The most sophisticated equipment will not produce the proper saving if the man who handles it works listlessly and laxly, without thoughtful, precise organization. Firm discipline and order and a high degree of organization and responsibility are the most important conditions for the well organized and uninterrupted work of the entire economic mechanism. That is a present-day requirement and a program task for the future.

The measures taken recently have strengthened discipline and order in production. But daily attention is not yet being paid to them at all enterprises. In some places people have grown accustomed to breaches of discipline which although seemingly minor, are grave because of their number. Absences on personal business, smoking breaks, pointless journeys and chatter, "family and household" errands, and horseplay -- these are typical wastes of worktime. These losses are not recorded and are considered innocuous. Yet every working minute now has a high price -- R1.5 million. That is the amount of industrial output which can be produced this year in 60 working seconds if, of course, they are all given over to work.

The communist organization of social labor, V.I. Lenin taught, "...will hold up all the longer the more it is maintained on the basis of the free and aware discipline of the working people themselves...." The elements of this discipline are collectivism and comradely cooperation, the respect and trust of every worker for the collective and of the collective for the worker and for his independence and initiative in labor. In such relations there is no place for idlers and chatterers, absentees and loafers, or embezzlers of the people's property.

Vladimir Ilich called the strengthening of daily labor discipline the hardest but most rewarding task. Because its solution directly affects the education of the man of the communist future and what is the most important, main thing for us -- a cardinal increase in labor productivity.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF EMIGRATION NOTED

PM261624 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 84 p 2

[V. Matulyavichyus article: "On the Foreign Shore. The Spiritual Collapse Suffered by the Man Who Deserted the Motherland"]

[Excerpts] Someone correctly remarked that man is like a tree in one respect. Cut a tree's roots off, and it will wither. Uproot a man from his native land, and the same fate awaits him.

I recently saw with my own eyes a man who had lost his mind through homesickness.

...The motor vessel Latviya sailed out of the Greek port of Piraeus. It is a huge port, stretching for kilometers on end, and we had to sail for 20 minutes along the shore before reaching the open sea.

We were sailing slowly, and the man walking along the pier was keeping up with us. He appeared to be 35-40 years old, and he may have looked older because of his unshaven chin and his torn and worn clothes. Not taking his eyes off us, he was walking quickly along the coast, as if trying to catch up with the departing ship.

"Strange kind of man," I said to first officer Sergey Lyanozov.

"That is Slavik," he uttered thoughtfully.

"Do you know him?"

"Many of our people here know him."

A few years ago, while in a foreign post, "Slavik" failed to return to his ship. Now one can only guess at what he has gone through in all this time, but one thing is clear -- his mind could not take it.

I have had many occasions to meet people who have broken from the motherland, and the sailors told me of many others. They can usually be divided into several categories.

I would include in the first category those who are tormented by homesickness. They are not only fugitives like "Slavik" who, generally speaking, are isolated cases. For many years our ships have been approached by aged representatives of the "white" emigres who had nothing else left but, analyzing the outcome of their lives like Bulgakov's character Khludov, to painfully stare at the sea's endless expanse with the motherland on its opposite shore. They came to the ships without any evil intentions, because history itself has answered the question: Who is right? Their only desire was to hear the native tongue, taste Russian bread, and, even if only for a moment, imagine themselves in the place where their thoughts turned in old age. Today there are hardly any of them left.

The second category consists of the simply curious. "How do people actually live there?" -- this is their prime motivation. Could it be worse than their own life?

The third category constitutes a special subject. They approach our people with a poisoned dagger beneath their cloaks, or more accurately with so-called literature.

They approach in pursuit of the sole goal of confusing our people and provoking them into unworthy deeds. And if they fail in this, they are satisfied with just spoiling their interlocutor's mood.

We, a large group of Soviet young people, recently visited the Canary Islands and were invited to a colorful carnival. Thousands of Las Palmas citizens, gathered at the city stadium, gave a standing ovation to the organizer's words announcing our presence.

This attitude moved us profoundly. And yet it was also there, in the same city, in the port where our ship was anchored, that some characters who had not missed the press reports of our arrival were roaming around. Their intentions, however, were of a different kind. Picking a suitable moment, they approached our boys and, in fluent Russian, started what seemed to be an informal conversation. But very soon they turned to all kinds of slander.

If you are offered something free in a bourgeois country, watch out: There is something behind it. It was enough to glance through the title pages of the bookelts that were offered to understand that in this instance the "selfless" intentions of our interlocutors covered the publishing and financial resources of "unions" like the People's Labor Alliance and Zionist and other types of organizations.

Political naivete, distortion, adventurist intentions, an illusory and essentially amoral desire to live opulently at someone else's expense without giving anything to society in return -- these are the basic renegades' motivations.

Imagine the following situation: Such a "Slavik" finds himself in a developed capitalist country and sees right before his very eyes the brightly-lit windows of numerous stores and advertisements shining with all the colors of the rainbow at every step.... He sees all this and, as the people say, he stands there agape. He gapes because he is still unaware of the internal springs of that society, hidden from the inexperienced eye, and unaware of the mind-boggling gap between the shining brilliance at the top and the privations at the bottom. And only the passage of time will make his mind appreciate the truth that these store windows are shining not for everyone, that beautiful streets can never take the place of home....

Once I had the opportunity to attend a session of a VUZ Komsomol Committee whose agenda, along with other questions, included a somewhat unusual point: the expulsion from the Komsomol of a young girl who had left the motherland. The unusual nature of this question left its mark on the session's work -- tension could be seen in the faces of the secretary and some of the committee members. It was obvious that they were in a hurry to be done with this unpleasant question on the agenda, and all it took was an announcement by the secretary and a vote. Thus the committee members deemed the "question" completed. None of them brought himself to say -- and some of them probably did not even think about it -- that in this way they were committing a certain error on behalf of their Komsomol organization.

I put forward some possible objections, especially in case the actors of that story are among the readers of this article. The case in question is really not simple. The girl left the motherland with her parents. So what was the value of the efforts made by her teachers, lecturers, and youth union comrades, what kind of efforts did they make over many years, if the girl took such a step in the end? Ideas and spiritual values alien to our society emerged victorious in this case.

Something else amazed me even more: Not one committee member thought that this case should have been the reason for a serious discussion about their responsibility for nurturing the world outlook of their comrades and such pivotal personal characteristics as loyalty to the motherland and awareness of duty to the people.

And yet this is the direct obligation of Komsomol organizations.

Leaving specifics aside, we are not talking only about renegades. Look more closely: Not far from them are some teenagers who fastidiously and openly demonstrate their scorn for everything created by the Soviet people's hands. There are also those who, at the height of their creative strength, engage in dubious deals or simply look on at others who are "hard at it" for their benefit. There is an elusive internal driving force in those fashionable young men and women who, with disheartening frivolity, are flaunting symbols which may just as well have been taken off the wings of the American vultures that are constantly hovering over our borders.

They are isolated individuals, but they are the very section of our young people who are constantly kept in sight by the numerous "fishers of men" of bourgeois propaganda and the seducers of bourgeois ideology.

Maybe none of this ought to be mentioned. Maybe -- had it not been for the lonesome figure of a man standing on the foreign shore, fading away into the distance.

CPSU ACADEMIC ASSESSES DANGERS OF RELIGION

PM262024 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 84 p 2

["Authoritative Opinion" by E.G. Filimonov, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Institute of Scientific Atheism: "Finding Oneself" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] We come across numerous questions connected with atheist education in the editorial mail. We asked E.G. Filimonov, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy Institute of Scientific Atheism, to reply to them.

Question: We all know Marx' expression that religion is the opium of the people. But, in arguments with believers you hear that allegedly only this applies to an exploited society. Is this true?

Answer: No, it is not. The Marxist classics' fundamental appraisals of the social functions of religion as the "opium of the people", its inhuman nature, and the damage caused by religion to society and the individual apply not just to societies with class antagonisms. They retain their full relevance in conditions of developed socialism too.

In different historical conditions religion has fulfilled and continues to fulfill the role of illusory compensation for human weakness and impotence engendered by limited practical mastery of the world. This is the chief function of religion. Marx spoke of religion as "the people's illusory happiness, transforming human reality into fantasy," and as a "sacred halo of human self-alienation," and "the self-consciousness and self-awareness of a person who has either not yet found himself or already lost himself again."

The permanent damage of religion is vividly expressed by the K. Marx' words that "the more a person invests in God, the less remains in himself," and by F. Engels' idea that "religion is essentially the emasculation of the entire content of a person and of nature and the transference of this content to the phantom of an omnipresent God... religion is an act of human self-destruction."

Question: How does a religious world outlook affect an individual's social activity?

Answer: Sociological research conducted in various regions of the country shows that believers are less socially active, in all forms, than atheists.

Let us take Belorussia as an example. In Grodno Oblast the influence of religion on young people's social activity was studied. What was the result? Among young believers of up to 28 years old every second, and sometimes every third, person questioned took no part in socialist competition, the rationalizers' movement, production management, and so forth, while 62.5 percent of atheists took part in these types of activity.

Research conducted in the Mari ASSR showed that among waverers and believers only 25.3 percent are library subscribers and only 15.7 percent have their own libraries. And 67.2 percent of the religious population did not read a book in the month before the investigation.

Three percent fewer believers and waverers read the central newspapers regularly than atheists. Some 63.1 percent of believers and waverers did not go to the theater or a concert in the course of a year. There were 86.9 percent atheists and only 2.6 percent believers among inventors and rationalizers, and 85.9 percent of believers do not speak at labor collective meetings.

Question: What damage does religion do to the rising generation, especially to children from families of believers?

Answer: The facts show that religious education does great moral and psychological damage to children. Educating children in the spirit of religious instructions and the fear of God (this is particularly typical of sectarian families) fetters children's social activity and prevents most of them from developing their abilities.

As research shows, children from religious sectarian families are, as a rule, only average students, and many of them do not take part in the school's social life and amateur artistic activities and do not go to the movies or theater. Through fear of punishment, they do not want to be young Octobrists, Pioneers, or Komsomol members. Coming into conflict with two different world outlooks at home and at school, the children often cannot endure the mental tension. Medical workers record cases of neurosis and psychopathy developing in children from families of religious parents.

In families where the parents are religious extremists, antisocial views, hostility toward atheists, lack of respect for laws, nonacceptance of the socialist way of life, and religious fanaticism are inculcated in the children.

Question: What influence do religious prejudices have on the development of national relations?

Answer: In the sphere of national relations religious prejudices form an objective brake on the process of internationalization, obstruct the cohesion of socialist nations, sometimes even help consolidate religious and nationalist prejudices, and kindle dissent on religious and national grounds.

The idealization of the history of your religion, your church, and your national and religious traditions and customs results in the distortion and deformation of national consciousness and the extinguishing of the international content in it.

Religious figures try to present religiosity as a feature of national originality and culture and regard the nonobservance of religious traditions as apostasy against national customs, and so forth.

This is why the struggle against religious ideology is an essential condition for educating the masses in the spirit of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

In discussing the damage done by religion, we must not forget the economic damage done to the individual and society by religious prejudices and various kinds of reactionary customs and traditions. Religious prejudices and superstitions are still an object of speculation on the part of various kinds of scoundrels: shaykhs, "self-styled" mullahs, in the "holy places", various kinds of fortune-tellers, quacks, and so forth, who make their fortunes illegally from people's religious prejudices and superstitions.

And we must ignore the great damage done by old rites, especially in rural localities. At the very height of the field work, religious holidays and rites divert many people from work, including atheists. This brings in its wake absenteeism, a reduction in labor discipline, and a drop in labor productivity.

This is particularly typical of the republics of Central Asia and the North Caucasus. We by no means assess religion's damage to Soviet society's life on these facts alone, but we must not disregard them.

All these antisocial manifestations sharply contradict the norms and principles of the Soviet way of life and the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) and December (1983) Plenums.

TRUCK DRIVER ON MISREPORTING OF FUEL DELIVERY

PM260947 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jan 84 First Edition p 7

[Letter from "Driver M.P." under the rubric "Let Us Talk Openly": "At Odds With Conscience"]

[Text] I wondered: Should I send you this letter or not? I know perfectly well you will not publish it. But I must straighten myself out -- I am tired of living at odds with my conscience.

I have worked as a driver in a motor transport column for over 20 years now. My family is fine -- I have two children to raise. I like my work, I know how to look after machinery, and I have my own car.

The party and government call on us to use fuel economically, and much is being done in this direction. But by no means all avenues via which fuel is lost have been barred. To be honest, the existing situation in regard to overreporting and gasoline retail prices suits us drivers, the leadership of the motor transport column, and even our clients, fine. If gasoline prices are raised again, we will welcome it. I will explain why I think like this.

When gasoline prices were considerably lower, it did not even enter drivers' heads to engage in speculation. And I used to fill my own car (which I acquired in 1967) at the gasoline pumps -- it was civilized, convenient, and inexpensive. Gasoline became more expensive and machinations involving it came to be regarded not as pettiness, but as a valid way of earning extra money.

Judge for yourselves: People will take a can of gasoline (20 litres) "off your hands" for R3. Any driver can save a can of fuel in a day's work. I say this from my own experience. I personally get an extra R60 on top of my wages from such savings. In addition I fill my own car free of charge and sometimes I "sneak" some to the dispatcher so he draws up the transport documents more rapidly. I stress that I am not stealing, but saving gasoline.

You ask how this can be done? Well, the reason is simply this. We get "saved" gasoline not just as the result of thrifty use. Overreporting of untransported freight gives us colossal figures for supposedly saved fuel.

Who has an interest in overreporting? Just about everyone. Overreporting works on the principle of you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. Clients eagerly overreport extra ton-kilometers for us. We close our eyes to transport idle time occurring through their fault, unplanned journeys, and so forth. The motor transport column's leadership resorts to overreporting because of the opportunity to fulfill the plan easily with no overexpenditure of fuel. And overreporting provides drivers with the following benefits: you overfulfill the plan without straining yourself, you get something extra on your wages, and you have "poached" [levyy] gasoline and indeed time for "poached" journeys.

In short, it would seem that there are advantages in overreporting for just about everyone. Everyone except the state. The machinations involving gasoline corrupt people, teach them a time serving mentality, and open the way to a money-grubbing attitude. Just you try to hand over saved gasoline! You will have so many adverse consequences that you won't want to get involved. The driver's expenditure norm will be immediately reduced for the next month, and you won't know if it will be enough for you. Your handover of surplus fuel will arouse no enthusiasm among the leadership or among your colleagues either. For after this the norm will be reduced for everyone.

I know that the situation which has been created at many motor transport enterprises must be eradicated. The vicious circle of vested interest in overreporting of untransported freight on the part of the client, the leadership of the motor transport enterprise, and the driver must finally be broken. If, for example, the driver suffers idle time through the fault of the client or the leadership of the motor transport enterprise, he ought not to lose pay. The genuinely guilty party should be answerable for the vehicle's idle time. How can this be done? Let economists and the personnel of fuel supply organs think about that. Many drivers would not consent to overreporting if they did not lose pay as a result of idle time. Reliable instruments are needed to monitor fuel expenditure.

Do not take me as self-centered. No, I do not consider myself to be, and others do not think of me like that. For 5 years I have been a team leader, I enjoy prestige in the collective, and I am a mentor. So why do I allow myself and others to engage in machinations? And how can things be remedied? The easy "poached" earnings are too deeply rooted among drivers.

I am sorry but I do not want to give my name, enterprise, or the place where I live and work. I expect there are similar motor transport columns in any big city. I have just written about an urgent matter. I could not do otherwise: My conscience is troubling me.

ORWELL'S "1984" REVIEWED ON EVE OF NEW YEAR

WA271111 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 52, Dec 83 pp 22-24

["'1984': Full Circle" -- by Victor Tsoppi]

[Text] A New Year's Eve treat awaits French TV viewers on channel FR3. They will be shown a steel cage specially designed to enable enormous, revolting rats to gnaw off the noses of charming women, victims of unfaithful men who pledged eternal love to them. Then will come "two minutes of hate," during which everybody must spit into a vile face shown on the screen. Then, instead of "Dom Perignon" champaigne, everyone will drink in one gulp from aluminium mugs a nasty swill called gin, but in taste, colour and effect more like waste machine oil. O'Brien, a high-standing official in the leadership of Oceania (the hypothetical country that is the scene of the story) will prove that 2 X 2 = 5. Or 3. Or whatever he wishes. Your memory will be crumpled up and pushed into a bottomless black hole known as the Memory Hole. Now you will never remember who you are and whether there ever was a country called France in the world. But you will understand quite clearly that history is a palimpsest-a parchment or paper written upon many times, the earlier writing being wholly or partially erased each time to make room for the next. The palimpsest is perpetual. There is no history, there never has been, and there is no need for it.

Big Brother, the ruler of the World, who keeps a relentless all-night vigil, watching viewers from the telescreen, is as eternal as his ineradicable formulas-the rules governing everyone's life and logic: "War Is Peace," "Freedom Is Slavery," "Ignorance Is Strength."

Big Brother and the "Last Man in Europe"

FR3 is devoting its New Year's Eve programme to the works of Eric Blair, an English novelist who died on January 21, 1950, at the age of 47, and whose pen name was George Orwell. The choice of the subject for the New Year's Eve television programme was not fortuitous. Orwell's most sensational novel was entitled "1984." For over 30 years this novel has been interpreted as a "portrait" of Soviet society and of real socialism in general, as the politico-fantastic prophecy of a genius who discovered, as World War II was ending, "totalitarianism, a threat to all of free, civilized, democratic mankind." So how could "1984" be forgotten on the threshold of 1984?

It is in place now to point out that the initial title of Orwell's novel was "The Last Man in Europe." And to ponder over the fact that Transoceania is today announcing its readiness to defend, to the very last European, Western Europe, which is to become an outlying province. However, paradoxical it may sound, Transoceania contains all the features of the Oceania described in such a dry, angry, anti-literary manner by George Orwell. Ever since "1984" was published, all manner of politologists, among whom there are many Orwellologists, have been feverishly banging over globes, jabbing fingers at our country: is the guesswork of the great chiromancist being fulfilled or not?

They're jabbing at the wrong spots. One of the few serious investigators of "1984" quite sensibly remarked that what Orwell seems to be saying is: "If you don't take care, if you don't wake up, here is what, in caricature form, WE run the risk of getting," WE,i.e. -the West. WE, i.e.-capitalism. In a letter to a friend the author himself said that in placing the action of the novel in Great Britain he was prompted, above all, by the desire to emphasize that the English-speaking peoples are no whit better than others, and that totalitarianism, if it is not fought, may triumph anywhere. He was writing, he said, because there existed a lie that had to be exposed.

During his by no means long life Orwell saw enough of the falsehoods of bourgeois democracy. For some years he was with the Indian Imperial Police in Burma. After being retired he was for a time a down-and-out in London's East End, living on Salvation Army soup. He shared dry crusts with the clochards of Paris. Tried to write in bourgeois newspapers about the slums, about the terrible living conditions of the English working people at the time of the Great Depression. Was a member at one time of the Independent Labour Party -- a Left-wing Labourite faction. Then he went to Spain, where he fought on the Republican side.

In his aimless, uncharted wanderings he repeatedly knocked his head against the walls of the world around him so that sparks flew from his eyes. At times he was visited by moments of insight: The exercise of power by Great Britain in India is no better than fascism, he wrote. He harboured a naive dream of a time when everyone would at last be able to live a decent private life behind his own fence. The dream was more and more frequently troubled by the despairing thought that power exists for its own sake. Those who wield the power will go on exploiting all the other citizens of Oceania for their own ends until the end of time, they will drive them to war for their own good....

Never would the "proles," deprived of all rights, rise from their knees, never would they win power for themselves. But to ensure that these "proles" did not become too despondent and thus begin to ponder over their unhappy lot, the powers that be established a whole system of degrading "values," among which were "pornosex" and "victory gin."

The book "1984" is a grotesque, generated by the bitter hopelessness of a social and political consciousness narrowed down to a negative bourgeois utopian vision of the world. For decades anti-communists of all hues have been straining to fit the tight "suit of totalitarianism" cut by Orwell onto real socialism. But their efforts are in vain. Each time it becomes quite clear that this unit is the right size for quite another social system -- for real capitalism, the exact measure of which was taken by Orwell.

When the Individual Vapourizes

It would, of course, to say the least, be an exaggeration to suggest that George Orwell was a convinced adherent of the communist outlook, of which, by the way, he had the vaguest of notions.

However, it would be just as wrong to ignore the fact that he found the "philosophical root of totalitarianism" that stamps out, or, if need be, "vapourizes" the individual, in the society in which he lived. Hence his novel is a grim warning precisely to bourgeois society, bourgeois civilization, bourgeois democracy -- in which, as he feared, the poisonous root of anti-humanism, all-devouring militarism and oppression has today thrust up truly monstrous shoots.

A characteristic sidelight: the television company sponsoring channel FR3 commissioned the compilation, production and presentation of the New Year's Eve programme dedicated to Orwell to the South Korean film director Nam June Paik. The native land of this maestro is one of those forbidden territories of Oceania where "truly free individuals" are subjected to the most exquisite torture, after which they "vapourize." A place where the cult of Big Brother reigns supreme, where it has long been proved, as truly as that two times two makes five, that "War Is Peace," that "Freedom Is Slavery," and "Ignorance Is Strength." If Paik is guided by the rule that "the truth of life is the truth of art" both he and Orwell will be ensured of success among French TV viewers.

Paik will not be able to do without updated interpretations of the main slogans of Oceania, for already in Orwell's time, Oceania planned to conquer both Eastasia and Eurasia and thus hold undivided sway over the whole planet.

"War Is Peace"

On the FR3 screens it will, most probably, appear something like this: against a background of excellent shots of nuclear explosions, of a landing party on Grenada, and of American soldiers shelling Lebanese villages, a good actor will read passages from the war doctrine of Oceania, from the section that is actually headed "War Is Peace." Let us, too, listen in....

"The problem was how to keep the wheels of industry turning without increasing the real wealth of the world.... And in practice the only means of achieving this was by continuous warfare. The essential act of war is destruction, not necessarily of human lives, but of the products of human labour. War is a way of shattering to pieces, or pouring into the stratosphere, or sinking in the depths of the sea, materials which might otherwise be used to make the masses too comfortable, and hence, in the long run, too intelligent. Even when weapons of war are not actually destroyed, their manufacture is still a convenient way of expending labour power without producing anything that can be consumed. A Floating Fortress, for example, has locked up in it the labour that would build several hundred cargo ships. Ultimately it is scrapped as obsolete, never having brought any material benefit to anybody, and with further enormous labours another Floating Fortress is built...."

In this connection, the presenter will go on, every individual "is expected to be competent and industrious.... He should be a credulous and ignorant fanatic whose prevailing moods are fear, hatred, adulation.... In other words, it is necessary that he should have the mentality appropriate to a state of war, that he should cherish an unshakeable belief that war is real, and that it is bound to end victoriously, with Oceania the undisputed master of the entire world.... This coming conquest is to be achieved either by gradually acquiring more and more territory and so building up an overwhelming preponderance of power, or by the discovery of some new and unanswerable weapon. The search for new weapons continues unceasingly, and it is one of the very few remaining activities in which the inventive or speculative mind can find any outlet.... And even technological progress only happens when its products can in some way be used for the diminution of human liberty. This entails two aims: to conquer the whole surface of the earth and to extinguish, once and for all, the possibility of independent thought. There are, therefore, two great problems that must be solved. One is to discover, against his will, what another human being is thinking, and the other is how to kill several hundred million people in a few seconds without giving warning beforehand....

"The scientist of today is either a mixture of psychologist and inquisitor, studying with extraordinary minuteness the meaning of facial expressions, gestures, and tones of voice, and testing the truth-producing effects of drugs, shock therapy, hypnosis and physical torture. Or he is a chemist, physicist, or biologist concerned only with such branches of his special subject as are relevant to the taking of life.

"In the vast laboratories of the Ministry of Peace teams of experts are indefatigably at work. Some are concerned simply with planning the logistics of future wars, others devise larger and larger rocket bombs, more and more powerful explosives and more and more impenetrable armour-plating; others search for new and deadlier gases or for soluble poisons capable of being produced in such quantities as to destroy the vegetation of whole continents....

"Do not forget, dear FR3 viewers and all the other inhabitants of Oceania, i.e., of the Atlantic Treaty countries, that the date for the achievement of these noble and lofty aims has arrived -- you are already living in 1984!" Thus, perhaps, Nam June Paik might close the programme he himself compiled and directed.

"Ignorance Is Strength"

The citizen of Oceania is not allowed to know anything of the tenets of other philosophies. Contempt for those doctrines is continuously nurtured in that country. People are taught to execrate them as barbarous insults to Oceanian morality and common sense. Nothing in Oceania is as effective as the Thought Police, under whose aegis any perversion of thought may safely be made.

"...Now I stop the hands of the FR3 clock! Stop! Time has stopped!" director Paik from Seoul will exclaim. What is most important, says Orwell, is that when people have mastered the slogan "War Is Peace" it is time for them to learn that "Ignorance Is Strength." Time must be stopped! Time must be killed! Progress must be stopped! History must be made to freeze in stony immobility! -- this is what the leaders of Oceania have always strived and are still striving for. And to make people -- like you and me -- forget history, erase from our minds all that went before. George Orwell himself said: "The heirs of the French, English, and American revolutions had partly believed in their own phrases about the rights of man, freedom of speech, equality before the law...." But Paradise on earth turned out to be impossible for the time being in Oceania. Why? Because, as Orwell wrote, "in the past no government had the power to keep its citizens under constant surveillance...." Now "every citizen... could be kept for twenty-four hours a day under the eyes of the police and in the sound of official propaganda.... The possibility of enforcing not only complete obedience to the will of the State, but complete uniformity of opinion on all subjects, now existed for the first time ... while economic inequality had been made permanent."

The rule of omnipotent Big Brother, who is changed every four years in present-day Oceania, is in these circumstances undivided and uncontrolled. As we can see for ourselves by the example of the present B.B. -- also known as R.R. -- all successes and victories emanate from him, above all from him; he is the inexhaustible source of wisdom, happiness, and virtue.... His function is to be a focus of love, fear and respect. He can declare, without a shade of doubt in his voice, that the killers in green berets operating on Grenada or in Lebanon are "missionaries of peace and freedom," and nobody in his immediate entourage will even attempt to put him straight. Raising his eyes to heaven, he can ask where such wonderful boys come from -- knowing beforehand the answer: they have been raised from the cradle in full submission to the will of his, Big Brother's, state, permitting no shoots of independent thought to sprout. The Thought Police work day and night: Even when a person "is alone he can never be sure that he is alone. Wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected. His friendships, his relaxations, his behaviour towards his wife and children, the expression of his face when he is alone, the words he mutters in sleep ... are all jealously scrutinized." Doesn't that sound just like a directive for the FBI?

So this is where these "wonderful boys" come from these "missionaries of peace and freedom"! What do they know of other countries and peoples? Their entire knowledge stems from the "two minutes hate" broadcast around the clock through dozens of TV and radio channels. Over years and decades. There is even no need to push their memories into the Memory Hole. They remember -- today this is so necessary and fashionable -- that the wholesale slaughter of women and children in Vietnam was a heroic feat.... Each one of them is "supposed to live in a continuous frenzy of hatred of foreign enemies and internal traitors."

In the Oceania visualized by George Orwell soon after the end of World War II there existed a Ministry of Truth, engaged in making clean copies of the past to please Big Brother. Not so long ago Ronald Reagan created an interdepartmental group under that very name -- "Truth." This organization was assigned the task of painting, in the most rosiest of colours, present-day Oceania -- both for internal consumption and for export, so as to whitewash the reputation of the greatest of imperialist powers.

Big Brother had a superaim in mind: by calling lies the truth, by rewriting pages of past history, to hold back for at least several millennia the march of history. Reagan has a grander aim: to stop history altogether by merely pressing a button.

"Freedom Is Slavery"

In the world created by the imagination of George Orwell only a person who refuted all signs and attributes of freedom and consciously became a slave of an unknown power, of an idea incomprehensible to his human mind, could consider himself as being truly free. Only a traitor might be called free, and the lower he fell into the abyss of treachery and baseness, the freer he became.

I shall, regrettably, not be able to view the New Year's Eve Orwell-show produced in Paris by the South Korean director Nam June Paik. However, I have had my fill of "profound" utterances totally lacking any intellectual decency in the French press connected with the coincidence of 1984 and "1984." To tell the truth, I got the impression that most of the authors of these reminiscences are employed in Orwell's Ministry of Truth, and work on the side in the Reagan group of the same name.

Not a single one of the interpreters of "1984" who have hastened to come out these days with statements on the pages of the Western press has had the wisdom, the courage, or the honesty to acknowledge at long last that George Orwell with his prophetic gift diagnosed the syndrome of present-day capitalism with which we must co-exist today for lack of something better, restraining with all our might its pathologically-militaristic, nuclear-missile ambitions.

...New Year's night is long. So perhaps, who knows, the South Korean presenter may succeed in convincing, on the example of his own country, his French television viewers that totalitarianism, or, rather, fascism, so recently sanctified by the visit of Big Brother from the White House, is a nasty social system. But was this the task assigned to Nam June Paik by the heads of FR3?

NEW FERRY LINKS BALTIC ISLAND WITH MAINLAND

PM251503 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 84 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Maiden Voyage"]

[Text] Kheltermaa (Estonian SSR), 19 Jan -- From now on the inhabitants of the Baltic island of Khiyumaa have been provided with reliable all-weather communication with the mainland. The icebreaker-ferry "Vokhilayd," built in Riga, set out from here on its maiden voage today. It is far more powerful than the previous ferries. Such a ship is undaunted by the ice that fetters the straits in the Moonzund Archipelago in winter.

There is a considerable improvement in the delivery of freight to the island and also in the dispatch to the mainland of fish and agricultural products produced by the islanders. Three more of these ferries will start running between the islands and the mainland in this 5-year plan. This is provided for in the plan for the archipelago's socioeconomic development.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN SOVIET ARMY EXAMINED

PM261125 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jan 84 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Article by Lieutenant General V. Arapov, member of the Military Council, chief of the Red Banner Central Asian Military District Main Political Directorate, and member of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, under the rubric "Our Soviet Way of Life": "Special Brotherhood"]

[Excerpts] The feeling of brotherhood and friendship between Soviet people of different nationalities has been alive within me, as it probably has been within every one of us Soviet people, since childhood. I was born and grew up in Argamakovo village, one of many similar villages in Penza Oblast. Nature in our region is beautiful and its people are friendly and hospitable. Whoever has come there has soon felt himself a part of one large family. Russians and Ukrainians, Tatars and Bashkirs, Udmurts and Mordovians live together in harmony in our village and in many other villages....

The friendship between soldiers is a special form of brotherhood. Its unprecedented durability has been tested in the fires of the civil war and the Great patriotic War. It also augments our strength today, being manifested in ordinary day-to-day affairs.

I recall an incident which occurred in our district. During the transfer of fuel from a railroad tank car into a receptacle, an accidental spark set the transfer hose on fire. Private Zh. Almambetov, Kirghiz by nationality, rushed to the shutoff value to stop the fuel flow. He displayed courage in his swift move and his actions, although his own clothes were already on fire. This quick action was supported by Pvt M. Uzakbayev, an Uzbek, Pvt V. Kozyarin, a Russian, and Pvt V. Tsay, a Korean. Their steadfastness overcame the mishap.

Numerous examples of fraternal mutual assistance and mutual aid can be cited from the life of the district's multinational military collectives. I regard as a kind of material embodiment of soldierly friendship the park constructed to mark the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation at the motorized rifle regiment where Lieutenant Colonel S. Shevchenko is deputy commander for political affairs. The first 15 saplings in it were planted by soldiers of 15 nationalities. Now the trees in the park are too numerous to count. Each year its area expands, sheltering people from the heat in summer and from biting winds in bad weather.

Is this not just like a true friend? He will cheer you up in times of difficulty, he will share your joys, and he will also travel with you the hard road of army life which turns yesterday's teenagers into real soldiers.

I recently had the opportunity to attend exercises at the Ninth Tank Regiment. The tank troops displayed brilliant skill. But I specially recall the following incident: After the strenuous work was done, the tank crew which had dismounted from its vehicle were approached by a Kazakh soldier who unhooked the water canteen from his belt and offered it to the tired tank driver -- a Russian boy.

This is hardly unusual. But is it not a manifestation of real friendship? In our part of the world, a sip of water from a comrade's canteen is a touching manifestation of it.

The episode I have narrated happened in the company commanded by Captain B. Maslov.

There were times when this subunit was by no means brilliantly successful. New servicemen arrived in the company. Many of the newcomers had a poor knowledge of Russian which, as it is well known, plays an enormous role in strengthening the international community of Soviet people. The company managed to eliminate this shortcoming quickly and to substantially raise the standards of mutual relations between soldiers of different nationalities.

I would note, by the way, that the Russian language problem still remains with some of the young soldiers from Central Asian republics. The commanders and political workers have to do the work that should have been done both by the school and those who deal with the training of young people of pre-conscription age. In order to speed up the instruction of first-year soldiers in the Russian language, we have organized in our district numerous study circles and courses. From the very first days of service we were striving to involve the newcomers, including, or perhaps mainly, the soldiers of non-Russian nationality in active social work.

We have achieved much in developing the standards of relations between nationalities. But life does not stand still. The traditions of inter-nation relations are developing further and it is important to understand profoundly the nature of the changes that are taking place. Speaking at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov emphasized that the improvement of developed socialism must without fail include a reasoned and scientifically substantiated nationalities policy. This is what determines our work in the multinational soldiers' collectives.

The Soviet Armed Forces are an embodiment of internationalism. This can be clearly seen in our district's example. We have serving here representatives of over 40 USSR nationalities and ethnic groups. They are all united by firm friendship and a common desire to execute with dignity and honor their sacred duty to defend the socialist fatherland.

The friendship, unity, and healthy climate in the international soldiers' collectives are the result of the wise nationalities policy of the party both in Soviet society as a whole and within the framework of its Armed Forces. They are also the outcome of painstaking and purposeful work by commanders, political workers, and the party and Komsomol aktiv. Questions of raising the standard of inter-nation contacts are the subject of constant attention by our district's military council and political directorate.

It seems to me that, in order to resolve these tasks successfully, it is very important to nurture a sense of spiritual proximity between people of different nationalities. This is the goal of political instruction in all its forms and of the cohesive strength of socialist competition.

A very important role is played by the close ties between military units and labor collectives. Almost every labor collective in Kazakhstan is multinational. The district's soldiers are frequent visitors at construction sites, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and industrial enterprises. On the other hand, it is a rare occasion when a celebration in a military unit takes place without the invitation of representatives of workers, agricultural working people, and the intelligentsia.

It has been repeatedly proven to us what great influence is exerted on the strengthening of ties between the Army and the people and on the nurturing of the feelings of internationalism by the help given by the soldiers of the district to the working people in gathering the harvest, solving other tasks, or combating natural calamities. This always generates feelings of gratitude among local residents and even greater appreciation toward the Armed Forces.

The strengthening and development of the standard of relations between nations is the goal of the various propaganda measures which are systematically organized in the district. It has, for example, become traditional to organize movie festivals under the slogan "Leninist friendship makes us strong." Reviews of national literature and music are organized and art exhibitions are held. We are also striving to ensure that the Lenin rooms and libraries are stocked with newspapers and journals from the republics whose representatives are serving in our district.

The acquaintance of soldiers from various nationalities with the Soviet people's spiritual assets is being actively conducted in connection with the preparation for the forthcoming USSR Supreme Soviet elections. This important political campaign offers new and great opportunities to demonstrate our socialist democracy and our way of life in all their specificity. At the same time, life itself and the Soviet reality provide convincing material for exposing the bourgeois ideologists who are banking on the fanning of national differences among our country's peoples.

Despite the monolithic nature of Soviet society, it is necessary to remember always that remnants of national egoism are still alive among individuals, kept alive by moral flaws [bytovoy izyan] which are still encountered at times, by religion, and by bourgeois propaganda. It is quite possible that they may recur wherever they are not resolutely rebuffed, wherever there is no daily educational work. We bear this in mind in our work and strive to acquire better knowledge of people and of the atmosphere in different soldiers' collectives.

It must be noted that today the solution of the problem of raising the standard of inter-nation communion has become to a certain extent both harder and easier. It is harder because the tasks of defending socialism are more complex. It is easier because the international feelings of people are stronger.

What is also important is that there is a greater influx of representatives from the peoples of various republics in the district's officer corps.

I recall that when I joined the Tashkent Tank School, students from among the local inhabitants could have been counted on one's fingers. Today that school, Alma-Ata's Marshal of the Soviet Union I.S. Konev All-Service Higher Command School, and other schools in Central Asia and Kazakhstan are training a considerable number of representatives of the indigenous population. There is no need to prove what favorable effect this has on the cause of the further strengthening of the friendship, comradeship, and cohesion of the multinational soldiers' collectives.

An ancient Eastern proverb says: "A bird's strength is in its wings, and man's -- in friendship." Throughout time people have been dreaming of a society which would bring to life the principle that one man is friend, comrade, and brother to each other man. It is in our socialist society that this principle became for the first time the norm of human relations. The great brotherhood of peoples in the land of the soviets is our pride!

HISTORIAN HITS WESTERN VIEW OF LENINGRAD BATTLE

LD261537 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 26 Jan 84

["Truth About Leningrad Battle Cannot Be Suppressed" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 26 TASS -- The desire of Western propaganda to hush up one of the biggest battles of the Second World War, the Leningrad Battle, has the aim to diminish the decisive role of the Soviet people and its Armed Forces in the victory over Hitlerite fascism.

This was stated at a press-conference in Moscow today by head of the Institute of Military History of the Defence Ministry of the USSR, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Pavel Zhilin. The press-conference was devoted to the 40th anniversary of the day of full liberation of Leningrad from the enemy blockade (January 27, 1944).

The Leningrad Battle, said Pavel Zhilin, just as other major battles of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people -- the Moscow Battle, the Stalingrad Battle, the Kursk Bulge Battle -- became one of the turning points in the course of the Second World War and led, as a result, to the final collapse of fascist Germany.

Western propaganda writes pseudo-history when it tries to speculate on the protracted character of the Leningrad Battle or refers to climatic and other conditions in which military actions were under way. The truth is that the Hitlerite military machine was crushed in the Leningrad Battle, just as in all other battles, not by frosts, not by lack of roads and not by any attendant circumstances -- the enemy was crushed by the strength of the Soviet Army, courage and staunchness of all the defenders of the city.

The Leningrad Battle is a major operation not only in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people but also in the Second World War, stressed Pavel Zhilin. He recalled that the battle lasted as long as three years (July 1941 -- August 1944).

Furthering its monstrous plan, the Hitlerite command barbarously bombed and bombarded Leningrad. About 150,000 shells were released and more than 107,000 (?air bombs) were dropped on the city during the battle.

Pavel Zhilin noted that the Leningrad Battle was of great political and military-strategic significance. The rout of the enemy grouping in the northern wing of the Soviet-German front predetermined Finland's withdrawal from the war, fully ensured Leningrad's security. The Leningrad victory opened the way to liberation of Belorussia, of the Soviet Baltic republics, and created prerequisites for the liberation of countries of central Europe, stressed Pavel Zhilin.

FAR EAST MILITARY PARTY CONFERENCE HELD

PM251648 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jan 84 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents Colonel A. Zakharenko and Lieutenant Colonel P. Chernenko under the rubric "Party Conferences": "Improving the Work Style"]

[Text] Take a look at the map, at the country's eastern regions. Imagine dozens of big and small permanent military camps and garrisons scattered about this vast territory stretching from the banks of the Amur to the Arctic Ocean. The area for which the Red-Banner Far East Military District is responsible incorporates five time zones. Intensive combat training is currently in progress everywhere, on firing ranges and tank training areas, in technical classes and at launch positions. Deeply aware of the complex and acute nature of the present-day international situation and of their personal responsibility for the defense of the socialist cause, the Far East troops are working hard to improve their military expertise.

The delegates brought the zeal of busy military life to their district party conference.

The reports by Army General I. Tretyak, commander of the district, and Colonel Yu. Belyakov, secretary of the District Political Directorate party commission, and the delegates' speeches provided an exacting and comprehensive analysis of the activity of political organizers, party committees and bureaus and party organizations. It was noted that in the period since the 26th party congress the role of party organizations in military collectives has markedly increased. The work style of most of them is characterized by an innovative approach to the solution of problems of educating cadres and all troops, consistently, purposefulness, initiative, and a creative quest for the most effective ways of ensuring high-quality fulfillment of combat and political training tasks.

Instructive experience of organizing matters in this way has been accumulated, for example, in the "N" formation which was represented at the conference by officer I. Sivovol. The formation's political organizer ably directs primary party organizations in the fulfillment of combat readiness tasks. The state of affairs in a party organization is judged not by the number of measures carried out but primarily by their results, by the effect they ultimately have on personnel organization, and by the way they invigorate the troops in socialist competition and in the solution of specific combat readiness tasks. This is the district's best formation.

Other focuses of advanced experience were named at the conference. For example, the tank regiment in which Major A. Yakovlev is a party committee member. The tank troops often call their party committee a "generator of ideas," and not just because they like the sound of it. The improvement of the training materials base, the intensification of the training process through the introduction of advanced training and educational methods, and the vigorous solution of other key problems of combat training -- this represents the party committee's substantial contribution.

It is important, Army General I. Tretyak said in his report, not to get carried away by success but, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov pointed out in his speech at the December (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, to maintain the pace, to maintain an overall positive attitude and develop positive processes more actively.

And there is still a lot to do in this respect. The conference delegates, in particular Comrade K. Makoyev, A. Strogov, and R. Tavadze, stressed that by no means all the military cadres, political organizers and party organizations have mastered the modern style of leadership. In many cases their work is too vague and sluggish, their approach is hackneyed, and they use obsolete methods.

The conference sharply criticized the Communists of the motorized rifle regiment in which Major V. Kazakov is a party committee member. Last year a number of its subunits obtained low ratings in the final check. Unit command and party activists came up with all manner of justifications. They blamed inadequate training materials, adverse weather conditions, and so forth. The real situation is that, if a man wants to, he will do the job; if he doesn't want to, he makes excuses. On this score the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum made the important point that what we need is not explanations but a real improvement.

Ideological work is an effective method whereby party organizations can influence the solution of the heightened tasks of combat and political training. The speeches by conference delegates Comrades V. Matskul, I. Rovnyy, and N. Krupnov concentrated on analyzing its content and the style, methods, and ways of conducting it. They noted that, in the organization of ideological education work, party committees and party bureaus have definitely moved in the direction of the specific needs of combat readiness.

At the same time, the delegates noted, ideological work is still affected by the old disease: notorious quest for volume, fear of new ideas and words; some propagandists avoiding acute questions and still underestimating ways of influencing people individually. That is, propaganda is becoming divorced from life, the danger of which was most clearly stated at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum. Why is this happening? To answer this question you have to look again at the work style of political organizers and party organizations. Many of them swear blindly that they favor a resolute move toward qualitative criteria in ideological work, but in practice they are advocating "gross" indicators.

The delegates' speeches considered the problems of improving the style and methods of intraparty work on ensuring that Communists set an example in carrying out party and official duty.

The conference was addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union V. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces. Stressing the complexity of the present international situation, he dwelled in detail upon the tasks of commanders, political organizers, and party organizations dictated by the interests of combat readiness and the reliable protection of the Soviet people's creative labor.

In all their organizational and ideological education work, the marshal of the Soviet Union said, party organizations must cement the forces, ensure the unswerving fulfillment of combat and political training plans, greater expertise on the part of the soldiers, and the ability to exploit the potential of combat equipment and armaments to the full.

The December plenum's point that, in the conditions of an international situation that has deteriorated sharply through the fault of aggressive imperialist circles, the unswerving fulfillment of plans is not only an obligation, but the patriotic duty of every Soviet person is very relevant to the Armed Forces. Communists must see the fulfillment of plans for combat and political training as their paramount obligation.

The solution of vital tasks in the combat training of forces, the speaker went on, is most closely linked to the standard of ideological work and the political and military education of personnel. This is conditioned by the fact that the imperialists are waging psychological warfare on an unprecedented scale against the USSR and all the other socialist community countries. Flouting all the norms of international relations, the class enemy is perpetrating all manner of provocations, eschewing neither lies nor slander and fueling hatred of socialism. Its aim is to discredit our social system and undermine the class and ideological unity of our peoples and the combat might and cohesion of the socialist countries' armies. This compels us to maintain a high level of vigilance, to promptly rebuff any imperialist intrigues, and to make vigorous use of all ideological potential in order to counter hostile propaganda. The role of party organizations and all Communists in the solution of these tasks is more crucial than ever before.

The conference was addressed by A. Chernyy, first secretary of Khabarovsk Kraykom.

The conference was attended by Admiral V. Sidorov, commander of the Red-Banner Pacific Fleet; L. Cherkasov, a senior CPSU Central Committee Official; and representatives of the local party and soviet organs.

EDUCATIONAL ROLE OF HEROISM IN MILITARY VIEWED

PM251504 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jan 84 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Heroes of Our Day"]

[Excerpt] The nature of service in our modern Army and Navy is that the heroism of daily martial labor and the heroism of a selfless deed are often indivisible. Exercises, firing practice, missile launches, the landing of personnel and equipment, the forging of water obstacles, ocean voyages, tours of combat duty, the assimilation of new equipment abound in complex situations requiring personnel to display courage and staunchness, resourcefulness and valor, combat initiative, and determination. Under these conditions the conscientious execution of duty of itself as it were frequently develops into an exploit.

We live in a heroic country, we serve under combat banners covered in the glory of brilliant victories in the battles of the civil and Great Patriotic Wars. And throughout our lives we are accompanied by the heroes of Great October, the heroes of the battles for the socialist fatherland's freedom and independence. Their exploits always remain for us an example of the deepest devotion to the cause of communism and of ideological conviction, evidence of the spiritual power of the man of the socialist society, aware of his personal responsibility for the destiny of his motherland.

The heroism of the Soviet man, of Soviet servicemen, has always rested on one source -- an aware attitude to his duty and profound ideological conviction. It was faith in Lenin's party, in the correctness of our communist cause, in the triumph of the ideals of Great October, which gave rise to the Matrosovs, the Smirnovs, the Pokryshkins, and the Zaytseves at the front. Today too devotion to the ideals of communism, love for the Soviet motherland, and implacability toward the enemies of peace and socialism arm us with spiritual strength for military and labor exploits.

We are living in troubled times. Imperialism is again saber-rattling, perpetrating direct acts of military aggression against the freedom-loving peoples, and pushing mankind toward nuclear war. Every Soviet serviceman must realize that the country's defense capability, the combat readiness of the Army and Navy, begin with his individual training, with the combat readiness of his detail, crew, subunit, unit, or ship. It does not become him to serve listlessly or to be satisfied with a mediocre result. Being an excellent marksman, driving combat vehicles skillfully, reducing the norms for preparing equipment, keeping it constantly ready for action, acting skillfully and daringly, resolutely and competently at exercises and training sessions, in the air, and on sea voyages, revealing the combat potential of personnel and equipment to the utmost -- that is martial heroism today.

Yes, in life there is always a place for an exploit, but to accomplish an exploit, you must be prepared for it. Hero of the Soviet Union, Communist, Lieutenant Colonel Vasiliy Shcherbakov was once asked what had enabled him to fulfill his flying mission in a very difficult situation in the Afghan mountains, deliberately take a dangerous risk, and save his comrades in arms who were in trouble? The officer replied: "An awareness of my duty." A great deal lies behind that simple reply. It was an awareness of his martial duty from his years as cadet which made Shcherbakov devote himself wholly to the study of the combat helicopter, to detect the "secrets" of piloting it in complex conditions, to develop in himself courage, will power, and coolness in critical situations and later to shape the same fighter's qualities in his subordinates. An awareness of his duty had forged the officer's heroic nature.

An awareness of duty, loyalty to their oath, a sense of profound personal responsibility to the party and people, link Lt Col V. Shcherbakov and Captain S. Kaverin, Hero of the Soviet Union Senior Lieutenant I. Ploskonos, and Captain A. Gavrilenko, commander of a scout company who fulfilled his international duty in Afghanistan, Captain A. Nesterov, who has defused many dangerous "surprises" left behind by the war, and Senior Lieutenant V. Batrakov, whose company recently won deserved thanks during exercises.

Our class enemies are now spending billions not only on new missiles and aircraft, tanks, and ships. Immediately after World War II, in beginning to prepare a new act of aggression against the USSR, they openly set their propaganda media the task of seeking with all their might to ensure that in a future war the Soviet Union has no Matrosovs or Kosmodemyanskiys. But our enemies' attempts to disarm our people spiritually are futule. At a terrible hour for the motherland, the heirs to the glory of the Matrosovs will be worthy of their immortal predecessors.

The people rightly call our Army and Navy a school of courage, staunchness, and high morality. Army and Navy service offer the best conditions for the formation and manifestation of the heroic in a man's character. The more strenous combat training, the more difficult the ordeals endured, then the more rapidly heroic foundations are reinforced in the serviceman's character.

The importance of daily political education work carried out vigorously and purposefully is also inestimable. There should be no indifference or formalism in this work. A great deal is lost when people forget to speak well and promptly about those who are in the lead, when a unit's heroes are mentioned only on holidays, when full use is not made of the enormous educational potential of military museums and combat glory rooms. It is important always to remember that a man, particularly a young man, as the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum noted, needs an ideal embodying the nobility of his life goals, ideological conviction, industry, and courage. And these heroes do not need to be made up: they are right there beside us. Noticing someone's selflessness, boldness, innovation, or nobility promptly, approving and supporting it, and telling everybody about it, if only in three lines of an express message, means setting a man on the path of maturation of a soldier, and generating in others the desire to follow and surpass their comrade.

Heroes of our day -- excellent-rated servicemen, top-class specialists, exacting and sensitive commanders, skilled educators of their subordinates -- are living and working alongside us in every subunit and unit, on every ship. Even if they have not been given big rewards, they can be recognized by their active life stance, which presupposes conscientiousness in service and combat work, inner discipline and composure, and the readiness to fulfill any order from their commander. When necessary these servicemen advance toward an exploit in a simple workaday, stern manner, as did their heroic fathers and grandfathers.

It is a high honor and responsibility to be in single formation with them -- an inseparable part of their great and dear people, the defenders of the great socialist fatherland!

CONFERENCE HELD ON MILITARY SCHOOL ADMISSIONS

PM251453 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jan 84 Second Edition p 2

[Major M. Zemskov report: "To Improve Selection for Military Educational Establishments"]

[Text] The Main Cadres Directorate and the Main Directorate for Military Educational Establishments under the USSR Ministry of Defense organized a conference of leadership personnel from cadres organs, Soviet Army and Navy military educational establishments, and republican military commissariats. It discussed the question of further improving the work on the selection and admission of young people to higher military educational establishments.

N. Grebenkin, executive of the CPSU Central Committee, and A. Zhuganov, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, took part in the conference's work.

The results of the conference's work were summed up by Army General I. Shkadov, USSR deputy defense minister for personnel.

MOSCOW MEETING OPENS 'MASS DEFENSE WORK MONTH'

PM251451 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jan 84 Second Edition p 5

[Reserve Colonel F. Semyanovskiy report: "Mass Defense Work Month"]

[Text] The ceremonial opening of the All-Union Mass Defense Work Month to mark the Soviet Army and Navy's 66th anniversary took place in the Hall of Columns of the House of the Unions 13 January.

Colonel General A. Odintsov, first deputy chairman of the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee, spoke about the events which will be held during the month.

Colonel General M. Sobolev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, spoke at the meeting.

The following took part in the ceremonial opening of the traditional month: A. Golyakov, sector chief in a CPSU Central Committee department; AUCCTU Secretary V. Makeyev; All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Secretary D. Okhromey; Armed Forces veterans; and representatives of the capital's public.